

A N. 3.
ANTIDOTE

Against the
INFECTION
O F

William Rogers's
B O O K,

Mis-called,
The Christian-Quaker Distinguished
from the Apostate and Innovator.

WHEREBY

The Envy, Falshood, Slander, Errors, and False
Doctrines contained in the said Book,
being plainly laid open.

The Charge of Apostacy and Innovation is just-
ly Retorted upon *W. R.* and his Adherents.

By **THOMAS ELLWOOD.**

*Seest thou a Man wise in his own conceit? There is more hope
of a Fool than of him, Prov. 26. 12.
And of some have Compassion, making a difference, Jude 22.*

*London, Printed for Benjamin Clark in George-Yard in
Lombard-street, Bookseller, 1682.*

Instead of a Preface to the Reader, I have
chosen to prefix, under Short Heads, the
General Contents of the Following Treatise,
in the several Chapters into which it is di-
vided.

C H A P. L

William Rogers his Perversion of the Words of Christ
[As I hear, I Judge] Deleted Page 2.
The True Sense of those words given. 3.

His Foul and Scandalous Reflection of Ignorance and Envy
upon some Friends, manifested to proceed from his own Ignorance
and Envy. 4.

His Infimulation, that Friends declined an Hearing, a Sall
and Abusive 5.

Causing Division, and making Discord amongst Gods People,
is matter of Evil-Fact 6.

His Little Brag, of his Friends well managing their Cause, is
exposed. 7.

W. R. begs the Question, that J. S. and J. W. have Lived
Well. 7.

Living Well is thereupon considered in a twofold sense, Proper
and Common. 7.

None can be said to Live well, in a strict and proper Sense, in
whom the Works of the Flesh, viz. Envy, Wrath, Hatred, &c.
are brought forth. 8.

W. R. endeavours to justify J. S. and J. W. by the Malice, of
Living well, proves unsuccessful. 8.

His Self-Contradiction, upon his Subject, is exposed. 9.

His Malicious Perversion of G. F. words, is exposed. 9.

W. R. was set on by others to write his great Book against Truth
and Friends. 13.

The Contents.

- His Rude and Irreverent Expression [of Dot'ng on Outward Orders, &c. and Pieces and Scraps of Paper, &c.] *Reproved.* 14.
 The Reasons he gives for his Treating of Principles and Doctrines, not real, but Fictitious. 15.
 That his Book was intended for the Worlds view (whatever hath been otherwise pretended) proved from the Book it self. 16.
 His Cavil at the words [have your Eyes to the Brethren] answered. 17.
 His Inference thereupon, Malicious and False. 18.
 His Self Contradiction in the Cases Noted. 19.
 His Cavil at the words [If you do not see your selves follow us that do see] and [shut out the Reasoning, the Wisdom, and the Jealousy without distinction,] answered. (See more of this pag. 69.) 19.
 His Scurrilous Reflections on some Friends, Reflected on. 20.

CHAP. II.

- William Rogers took great pains in Travelling to and fro to reproach and defame G.F. behind his back. 21.
 Yet avoided Meeting him Face to Face. 22.
 His Excuses to palliate it Scanned, and found to be Pitiful, Sorry Shifts. 23.
 The Medium he hath used to manifest his Righteousness in proceeding to Print, doth manifestly consist of Unrighteousness, Deceit and Falshood. 24.

CHAP. III.

- A Difference made between obstinate Opposers, and others, who, though, in some things, through wrong Informations, misled, yet keep out of Enmity, and retain a Tenderness. 28.
 Our Adversaries way, of Framing Objections and making Answer, in the Name of Friends, proved unfair and very abusive. 28.
 Their Cavil at Monthly and Quarterly Meetings being called the Church, considered. 29.

The Contents.

In what Sense these Meanings may be so easily explained, and their false Reflections on these Meanings, Reprehended.	30.
Their Abuse of Robert Barclay noted, and he Vindicated.	31.
Their Self-Contradiction upon this subject, manifested.	32.
Our Adversaries convicted of Falshood and Slander, in suggesting that Friends have contrived a Method of carrying all things by the Generality or Major number of Votes.	33.
Their Cavil about believing as the true Church believes, examined and Answered.	34.
Their Self-Contradiction upon this Subject, noted.	36.
Their Abuse of that Friend, upon whose words their Ground of their Cavil, manifested, and he Vindicated.	37.
Our Adversaries proved to be one in Spirit, ground and Root with other Apostates in former years.	38.
Their Cavil about establishing the Churches in the Holy Order of Truth, refused.	39.
Their Notion of Independency examined, and found to be a Dependency on men.	40.
Their Abuse of a Friend, whom they call an eminent Person, and a Publick Preacher, Noted.	41.
Our Adversaries taxed with Dishonest dealing in Slandering upon Report.	42.
The danger of running into Locusts discovered, and a Slandrous Suggestion of our Adversaries, noted.	43.
The meaning which our Adversaries have given to some of the Words of Church Government, examined in the Texts they have given.	44.
They themselves doubtful whether that be our Meaning or not. Yet prosecute it, as our Meaning.	45.
Their Self-Contradiction in this Case noted: And the meaning they give, as ours, proved agreeable to the practice of their own Party.	46.
Their Confused Comment upon Mar. 18. 19. &c. refutedly refuted on.	47.
Their Inconsistency both with themselves, and with the Text, laid open.	48.
Their Abuse of R. Barclay touching Assent of Parties in composing differences, noted, and he Vindicated. (Of this see more, pag. 129, &c.)	49.
Their Fallacious Gloss on Luke 12, 13, 14. discovered.	51.
Their	

The Contents.

Their Cry against Imposition, and Blind Obedience, without Ground, though not without an Evil Design.	32.
Their Design against Monthly and Quarterly Meetings discovered.	33.
Their Lurking Suggestions, about Outward Headship and Supremacy, proved Slandrous and Malicious. Christ Jesus the only head of his People.	35.
Our Adversaries Confusion, and Self-Inconsistency in assigning the ground and Rise of the Difference. (See more, pag. 118.)	36.
Their Suggestion that many do look upon G. F. as set in the like place as Moles was, rejected for a Malicious Slander; Their Proof required.	37.
Their Charging some Friends with Concluding they are entered into the Possession of the Power of God, because they take upon them to be Members of a Womens Meeting, distinct from the Men; a False, Foul and Malicious Slander.	38.
The Qualifications our Adversaries give of Satans Instruments, proved very agreeable to themselves.	39.
Their Self-Contradiction thereupon, noted.	40.
A just Reprehension of their Dishonest Dealings, in Slandering upon Report, pag. 30. Many Instances given of their so doing.	41.
The Paper they have Printed in the Name of E. Bartoughs, examined, and justly suspected to be Spurious.	41.
It is proved Unsound.	42.
And Misapplied by our Adversaries.	43.
Their Slighting the Heavenly motion on the Spirit of G. F. or any other Friend in Truth, is a Slighting the Cause of God.	44.
Their False Inference therein, and Idle Carping thereat, rejected.	44.
Their Mangleing Friends Writings, like Hicks the Baptist, proved and reprov'd.	45.
Their Agreement with the other Apostates of this day, in Reproaching and Slandering G. F. noted.	45.

CH A P. IV.

- O**ur Adversaries join with the World in Accusing Friends,
and suggest unto the World Slanders against Friends. 67.
Their Cavil against the Churches Infallibility, refuted. (See
more, pag. 105.) 68.
Their Charge, that some Friends have Preached against All
Wisdom, and All Reasoning; a Slander, Contradicted by
themselves. 69.
Their Discourse of Creaturely-Wisdom, &c. Erroneous. 70.
The word [Sensual] in Jan. 3. 16. by them misunderstood,
explained. 70.
They misunderstand the meaning of the Apostle, by [The Wis-
dom of the World, &c.] 71.
They manifestly pervert these words of Solomon [The Mouth
of the Just bringeth forth Wisdom,] Prov. 10. 31. 72.
And of the Apostle, exhorting the Saints not to Walk in Wis-
dom, Col. 2. 1. 72.
And of Christ, when he said, Wisdom is Justified of her
Children, Mat. 11. 19. 73.
They manifest their Ignorance in treating of Knowledge. 74.
Their Discourse concerning the Tree of Knowledge, Un-
sound. 75.
In pleading for the Test of Knowledge being Good or Bad,
they promote the Devils Doctrine. 76.
To favour their Opinion they pervert the Words of Christ,
Joh. 17. 3. 76.
Their Doctrine, in this Case, contrary to what was Delivered
by Friends in the beginning, proved by the testimony of R.
Flowell. 77.
Our Adversaries Conclude of Apostasy and Innovation. 77.
Their Judgement is Erroneous in the Affairs of Truth. 78.
Their Discourse concerning Baptizing full of Confusion and
Error. 79.
Their Assertion [That there is no reason to conclude, that
Christs Commission to Baptize, was intended to continue as an Or-
dinance under the Gospel-Dispensation, until the Consummation of
all things,] is grossly false and Erroneous. 81.

The Contents.

To favour their Erroneous Opinion, they take upon them to alter,
and thereby corrupt the Text, Mat. 28. 20. 81.

The Text Vindicated, and their private Interpretation re-
jected. 82.

Their Cavil at the Translation of Heb. 9. 26. growndless. 83.

Their Indecent Reflection on the Disciples of Christ, on Christ
himself, and on the Holy Ghost, laid open and justly reprov'd. 84.

Their Discourse touching the Supper of the Lord, very Con-
fused and Inconsistent. 85.

Their Discourse concerning Faith very Erroneous. 87.

That the least degree of true Faith is accompanied with some mea-
sure of Gods Salvation, prov'd. 88.

They Confute themselves, upon this point. 89.

And they Condemn themselves. 90.

C H A P. V.

Our Adversaries unfair in the method they took of Answering
the Testimony of the Yearly Meeting, Subscribed by 66. 91.

Their several Allegations against the Meeting it came from, con-
sidered. 92.

Their Cavils against several Passages in that Testimony, re-
futed. 93.

Their Charge against the 66 Subscribers of that Testimony,
Answered. 95.

The Coycts they spread over J. S. and J. W. prove too nar-
row. 96.

Their Reserves about Tith-paying and Flying in Persecution,
neither Seasonable, nor Sound. 97.

Their Scandalous Reflection upon Jasper Barr, reprov'd. 101.

Their Envious Comparing of Jasper Barr and three other pub-
lick Labourers, to four blind Priests, censured. 107.

J. S. and J. W. not Judged before they were Heard, but Heard
before they were Judged. 108.

C H A P.

The Contents.

C H A P. VI.

O ur Adversaries Position, that <i>Christ's Government is not represented by Visible Persons, &c.</i> Examined.	110.
The Government of Christ considered in a twofold Sense, with respect to particulars, and to the general.	111.
Instrumental means necessary in Governing, as well as in Gathering the Church, proved.	112.
Six marks, whereby our Adversaries say the Opposers of Christ's Government may be distinguished, examined, and found Applicable to themselves and their own Party.	115.
Their Insinuation that Monthly and Quarterly Meetings were established by man, False; and Contradicted by themselves.	116.
Their Suggesting, that those Meetings are so fixed to certain days, that they cannot be altered, proved False.	116.
Their Surmising a danger of Friends Idolizing Meeting days, groundless and Evil.	117.
The Breach and Difference occasioned by themselves.	118.
W. Rogers his Answer to R. Barclay's Book examined. He enters with an Untruth and Slander.	119.
His Concession to Church-Government Observed.	120.
Some Cavils of his against R. Barclay, Answered.	121.
His Mistake and Self-Contradiction, about the Order of the Gospel Noted.	122.
He is taxed with using the words of the Apostle, Col. 2. 6, 7. deceitfully.	124.
His Objection, that Christ doth not need man's assistance to establish his Government, Answered.	126.
His Cavil against the second days Weekly Meeting in London, Answered.	127.
That his Book was not published on Truths behalf, proved from his own words.	129.
His Abuse of R. Barclay about Church-Power, noted: R. B. Vindicated.	130.
The Necessity of Church-power for Composing differences arising between the Members of the Church, demonstrated: And W. R.'s narrow Limitations proved Obstructive to the Course of Justice.	131.
His Cavil about Assent of Parties, but a Pretence: The Design being against Church-Government it self.	136.
Some Reflecting Cavils of his against R. Barclay, and other Friends, Answered.	137.

The Contents.

<i>He Carps at R. Barclay for Searching the Scriptures after the words Order, Rule, &c.</i>	140.
<i>His Dishonesty in Maiming the Scriptures quoted by R. Barclay, and in reciting his words imperfectly, and yet not Answering them, Noted.</i>	141.
<i>His Suggestion, That it is to be doubted R. Barclay's meaning is, others ought to obey, whether they see it their duty or no; a meer Slander, refuted by R. Barclay's own Book.</i>	143.
<i>His Sophistry in Evading, not Answering; the force of R. Barclay's Arguments, noted.</i>	144.
<i>Some Queries and Cavils of W. R's Answered.</i>	147.
<i>The Occasions which drew the Apostles to assert their Authority in the Lord, opened, and compared with the like now.</i>	150.
<i>W. Rogers his Arrogance and Self-Conceit justly traced.</i>	153.
<i>His Confusion, in Treating of Doctrines, noted.</i>	155.
<i>A Slandorous Insinuation of his Refuted.</i>	156.
<i>His Mistake of the Apostle's meaning (Phil. 1. 15, 18.) Noted, and the True Sense given.</i>	157.
<i>A Slander of his Retorted.</i>	158.
<i>His Abusive Insinuations against Friends noted, and refuted.</i>	159.
<i>His False-dealing with R. Barclay laid open.</i>	160.
<i>W. R. contradicts himself in his Judgment of R. Barclay.</i>	164.
<i>His Confusion and Self-Contradiction concerning the Members of Christ's Body, manifested.</i>	165.
<i>An Assertion of his proved Erroneous.</i>	166.
<i>His misunderstanding of several Scriptures manifested.</i>	167.
<i>His Foul Error, and Contradiction to the Apostle about delivering some to Satan, Noted.</i>	168.
<i>The Phrase explained, and cleared.</i>	169.
<i>The Power of the Church asserted from Acts 15. And W. R's Manifold Errors, in his Comment upon that place, detected.</i>	170.
<i>His Cavilling Query [where lieth the Service to God and Truth, for any to concern themselves to treat on the Authority of the Church] Answered, and the necessary Service thereof shewed.</i>	176.
<i>Two gross Errors of W. Rogers, in his Comment upon Mat. 18. 17, 18. discovered.</i>	178.
<i>An Idle Digression and unsuitable Comparison of W. R's, Noted.</i>	180.
<i>Some Carping Queries of his Answered.</i>	182.
<i>His Abuse of R. Barclay's words manifested.</i>	184.
<i>His Suggestion, that Friends would inforce a Submission without fight, proved False and Slandorous.</i>	185.

The Contents.

As Blind Obedience is not acceptable: So Blindness will not excuse Disobedience unto God. 186.

W. Rogers Unsound in his Application of Christs words, Mat. 28. 20. 189.

His frequent Abuse of R. Barclay about the words [Tolerable Supposition] Noted, and R. B. Vindicated. 190.

His Erroneous Judgment and Self-Contradiction, in that Case, laid open. 192.

His Testimony thereupon rejected, as unsound and unfavoury. 193.

A most foul Error and False Doctrine of W. R., detested. 193.

Another Error of his [That the whole Church of Christ is lyable to Err] discovered and disproved. 195.

His Inconsistency with himself, and with his two Brethren, J. S. and J. W. Laid open. 196.

C H A P. VII

John Wilkinson and John Story were for having the way of Truth like the way of a Ship in the Sea, which the Scripture compares to the way of an Adulterous Woman. 198.

W. Rogers his Insinuation that G. F. is of an High and Lofty Spirit, proved Malicious and False. 200.

His Base and Unworthy Reflection upon G. F.'s Parentage and Trade, justly censured. 201.

Several Cavils of his against G. F. answered; and his Envy therein discovered. 202.

J. Wilkinson's Divination against Friends rejected. 204.

C H A P. VIII

Our Adversaries Cavil against G. F. for Quoting Micah's Mother Answered. 204.

Their Cavil against G. F. for Quoting the Woman of Tekoah Answered. 210.

Their Cavil against G. F. for Quoting the Assemblies of Women mentioned in 1 Sam. 2. 21, 22. Answered. 212.

Their Cavil against G. F. for Quoting Rachel's and Leah's Council to Jacob Gen. 31. Answered. 213.

Their Cavil against G. F. for Quoting Jeptha's Daughter, Answered. 214.

Their labour, in vain, to acquit themselves from the Charge of Covenant-breaking. Their Guilt in that matter demonstrated. 216.

William Rogers his Foolish Boasting Noted. 221.

The

The Contents

<i>The Rudeness of his Style taxed.</i>	222.
<i>A Silly Cavil of W. R.'s Answered.</i>	222.
<i>He Attempts, in vain, to prove G. F. a Flyer in time of Persecution.</i>	223.
<i>His four Certificates, to that purpose, examined, and found Faulty.</i>	224.
<i>His Idle Cavil against the Account G. F. gave of that business, examined.</i>	225.
<i>Some other Cavilling Observations of his, upon G. F.'s Account of the Meeting at Ringwood, examined, and found to be Impertinent and Envious.</i>	228.
<i>J. Story and his Party in Westmoreland, their Skulking Way of Meeting hiddenly, intime of Persecution, laid open and censured.</i>	229.
<i>The Conclusion.</i>	233.

The most Material Faults of the Prose are thus to be Amended : What other Escapes have Escaped Correcting, the Reader is desired to Correct or overlook.

PAGE 3. line 26. read John 7. 24. p. 8. l. 21. for p. 29. r. p. 19. p. 9. l. 18. for p. 27. r. p. 57. l. 26. works r. marks, l. 99. work r. mark, part. l. 4. this r. the, p. 12. l. 31. engaged r. engaged, p. 19. l. 3. part 3. r. part 1. p. 20. l. ult. false r. falseness, p. 22. l. 28. dist r. dost, p. 24. l. 5. J. B. r. J. C. p. 27. there false, thee evil insinuations r. those evil insinuations, p. 25. l. 31. the r. then, p. 27. l. 35. the r. thy, p. 28. l. 4. the r. thee, l. 6. thought r. though, l. 26. rejected r. repeated, l. 24. from r. for in, p. 30. l. 16. yerr. as well as, p. 32. l. 21. them reciprocal r. them reciprocal, p. 33. l. 2. where these Meetings are r. when these Meetings were, p. 34. l. 17. circumspect r. more circumspect, p. 36. l. 34. as the Church believeth r. as the rest of the Members do, p. 37. l. 35. Sentence r. Censure, p. 38. l. 4. Confess r. profess, p. 40. l. 10. r. 2 Cor. 7. 15. p. 41. l. 16. men r. man, p. 50. l. 5. word r. world, p. 67. l. 18. suggest r. to suggest, p. 68. l. 12. indeed r. need, p. 70. l. last pretty r. a pretty, p. 73. l. 6. Wisdom which r. Wisdom by which, l. 13. declare r. declaim, l. 23. professing r. who professing, p. 74. l. 15. word r. wood, p. 76. l. 38. r. being duly considered, p. 77. l. 34. p. 126. r. p. 186. p. 79. l. 12. intendant r. intendment, p. 83. l. 11. ryxus r. ryxus, p. 99. l. 24. is the bringing r. against the shrivings, p. 101. l. 12. so that r. so that, p. 102. l. 38. the Brethren, to the Brethren too, p. 140. l. 11. saying, that r. saying that, p. 142. l. 33. ver. 12. r. ver. 2. p. 113. l. 31. are (2 Cor. 7. 28. r. is (2 Cor. 7. 12. p. 129. l. 2. become r. be gone, p. 135. l. 19. they r. thy, p. 195. l. ult. a confession r. by contrair, p. 128. l. 32. undertaking r. understanding, p. 128. l. 29. refuse r. refuse, p. 170. l. 29. were they r. were not they, p. 171. l. 2. at last r. at least, p. 172. l. 20. with your r. without your, p. 173. l. 15. assume themselves, r. assume to themselves, p. 190. l. 9. Rock Christ would r. Rock Christ, is would, p. 195. l. 18. what r. what, p. 195. l. 2. Church in r. Church is in, p. 196. l. 34. unquestion r. unquestionable, p. 201. l. 9. evil of good r. evil and good, p. 203. l. 17. when he had r. when to be had, p. 205. l. 23. Eliza r. Elizabeth, p. 206. l. 18. once r. one, l. 18. where r. where, l. 20. record r. records, p. 209. l. 2. words r. words, p. 215. l. 17. moved, p. 215. l. 2. shall be r. shall surely be, p. 215. l. ult. shall, p. 215. l. 29. the r. the.

To William Rogers, and the rest of the Enemies of Truth, concerned with him in his Work of Darkness, Entituled, The Christian Quaker, &c. T. E. sincerely wisheth Godly Sorrow, and unfeigned Repentance, unto the Acknowledgment of your Fault.

I Did not think, until very lately, that I should have been thus publickly concerned in a Testimony against your Book: But Providence having cast one of them into my Hand; in Reading it over, I felt a just Indignation rise in my Soul against that unclean Spirit, which hath opened its foul Mouth, through you, in Blasphemy against the Truth and People of the Lord. I also felt Compassion in my heart towards such as have been unawares betray'd by the sly Insinuations and specious pretences of that seducing Spirit, and thereby drawn from the simplicity and innocency of the Truth, into false jealousies and evil surmises against their Brethren. And to such I had a sense, of some Observations I had made, in reading your Book, might be serviceable. That I might therefore conscientiously discharge my duty in both these respects, by bearing a plain down-right Testimony against that evil Spirit that hath appear'd in you, and the mischievous work it hath brought forth through you; and by informing the minds of such as already are, or are in danger to be misled thereby, the following Sheets are made publick. In which I intend not to take notice of every passage in your Book, that is wrong and justly to be excepted against (for then I might write a large Folio) nor yet to insist at large upon all those passages that I do take notice of (for that also would swell this Treatise beyond what I would have it) but briefly to deliver some Observations, which in reading your Book, I have made; wherein your Envy, Malice, Falshood, Errors, and Slanders being, in some measure, exposed and laid

open, they who are not so quick, as from an inward sense only, to favour and discern Spirits, may (according to the Rule ye so often mention) by the Fruit ye have brought forth, be enabled to judge, what Spirit it is ye have been acted by.

CHAP. I.

Sect. 1. **T**Hese things premised, I shall now (passing by, at least at present, the Title Page of your Book), begin with the beginning of the Preface; In which, William, I observe, *In ipso lumine cadis*, thou stumblest at the Threshold, and erreſt in the very Entrance. Thou beginnest thus, *It was the saying of Christ, [As I hear, I judge.]* This Sentence thou repeatest often in the Preface and Book, applying it to the outward Hearing of the outward Ear, and comparing it with what Nicodemus said, *Doth our Law judge any man before it hear?* And in the seventh Page of thy Preface thou sayest, *When I consider the aforesaid words of Christ, [As I hear, I judge;] and that it sprung from him, who was partaker of his Father's life and power, and knew all things; its to me a real confirmation, that a pretence to life, power and discerning of Spirits, cannot be a sufficient Plea, to justify a practise contrary to that Example.* This plainly shews thou takest those words of Christ in a carnal sense, of Hearing with the outward Ear. But in this, William, thou dost manifestly Err, and put a wrong construction on the words of Christ. For the Hearing, which Christ there speaks of, was not the Hearing of the outward Ear (For of that it was Prophecied of him, *He shall not judge after the sight of his Eyes, neither reprove after the Hearing of his Ears, (Ia. 11. 3.)* but the inward Hearing of the voice of his Father, as appears from the foregoing and following words. He had said, *Joh. 5. 19. The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do;* And Verse 22. *That the Father had committed all judgment unto him.* And Verse 26, 27. He saith, *As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself: And hath given him Authority to execute Judgment also, because he is the Son of Man.* Then in the 30th Verse, He saith, *I can of mine own self do nothing; [As I hear, I judge] and my judgment is just, because I seek not my own Will, but the Will of the*
Father

Father which hath sent me. And Chap. 8. vers. 26. *I have many things to say, and to judge of you; but he that sent me is true, and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him.* And again Verse 28. *When ye have lift up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of my self: but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.* From all which it is apparent, That the Judgment He gave was from the Life, which the Father had given him to have in himself; That as he could do nothing of himself, but his doing depended on what he saw his Father do, so his Judging also depended on what he heard from his Father; and because in Judging he hearkned to his Father, he sought the Will of his Father, therefore his Judgment was just. But when he saies, *I speak to the World those things which I have heard of him,* and that particularly with relation to Judging (as in John 8. 26.) he leaves no room for any one to doubt, that by those words [*As I hear, I judge*] he meant the Divine, Spiritual, Inward, Heavenly hearing of the voice of God. This Beza, who Translated the New Testament, could see (though thou, it seems, didst not) For in his lesser Notes upon those words [*As I hear, &c.*] he saith, [*As God who dwelleth in me, putteth into my mind.*] And this Judging from an inward sense, or from hearing the Divine Voice of God's Spirit speaking in the Heart, is that Judgment which Christ hath contradistinguished from the Judgment that is given according to appearance, when he said, *Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment,* John 7. 2, 4.

Sett. 2. In the seventh Page of the Preface, proceeding upon the forementioned Error, thou hast cast a foul and scandalous Reflection upon Friends, charging them with Ignorance, Envy, or that which is worse (though one would think Envy were so bad, it were hard to find anything worse.) Ignorance, thou saist, in those who have believed, that outward Ministers are ordained of God, amongst the People called Quakers, to see for the body, and hear for the body, and on that foot, sign and glory in other mens lives, made ready to their Hands, whether they know any thing of the Truth thereof, or no. This is an high Charge, William, too high to be thus flung out at random: If thou knowst any that have believed as thou hast here suggested, it had better become thee to have exhibited thy Charge against such in particular. But truly I do not believe there is one Soul, of the People called Quakers, that doth believe as thou hast here

here reported. And if there be not (which, till thou hast made appear there is, may reasonably be supposed) what can it be but the fruit of Ignorance and Envy in thy self, to insinuate such a slander in general, and not be able justly to fix it upon any one in particular? But that thou maist see, *William*, how fruitful *Envy* is in bringing forth *Slander*, I desire thee to look back a few lines in the sixth Page of thy Preface, where thou speakest of some amongst the People called Quakers, whom thou representest *Insinuating*, *As if God had ordained Ministers amongst them, that are to see and hear for the body, &c.* Whence I observe, that what in that sixth Page was pretended to be but an *Insinuation* [*As if*] is here in the very next Page, Brooded, Hatch'd, brought forth and improved into a kind of formal Charge, *That some have believed, that outward Ministers are ordained of God, amongst the People called Quakers, to see for the body, and hear for the body, &c.*

Then for thy Charge of *Envy*, or (whatever thou meanest by it) *that which is worse*; that thou hast a mind to fix upon somebody more particularly, whom yet thou dost not name, but describest to be such an one, *as hath used both acquired and natural parts, from the strength of Reason, Testimonies of Scripture, Arguments from the Light of Christ, Citations out of Antient and modern Writers, as well as Examples of antient Fathers, to convince some Professors of Christianity of their Errors; and yet imperatively signifie, To God's friends every where, on this wise: Let not this Spirit be reasoned with; enter not into Proposals and Articles with it: but feed it with judgment, that's God's Decree.* Surely, *William*, if *Envy* had not clouded thy understanding, thou couldst not be ignorant, that these Methods are consistent each with other, and both with Truth. For Testimonies of Scriptures, Arguments from the light of Christ, strength of Reason, Citations out of ancient and modern Writers, and Examples of antient Fathers, are proper Mediums (being rightly, and in the wisdom of God, made use of) to convince Professors of their Errors. And, if need were, I could instance the use of all these means, and to the same end, in the Writings of the New Testament. Yet is not any of these more proper to the end to which they have been used, than judgment is (*judgment from the God of judgment*.) to that ungodly Spirit, that seeks by all the waies it can, by secret fraud and open opposition, to rend, divide, destroy and utterly lay waste the Heritage of God. And though the love of God may have drawn some to use their endeavours for the recovery of others out of the jaws

of

of this *devouring Spirit*, and in order thereunto have reasoned, discoursed, conferred with such, labouring, if it might have been, to have plucked them out of the Fire, as *Jude* speaks, *verse 23.* yet God forbid that any, whose eye the Lord hath opened, should enter into Proposals and Articles with that Spirit, whose way leads to the Chambers of Death.

Sett. 3. Next thou saist, *The endeavours of some have taken such an effect, as that the abused Parties readiness to abide an hearing, before a competent number of persons, equally to be chosen, if any one had matter of evil Fact, or false doctrine to lay to their charge, would not be accepted.* This, *William*, is one of thy *politick* Innuations, by which thou wouldst procure *undeserved* Compassion to those thou mis-callest the abused Party. For had they been ready, or could have been prevailed with, to have abidden a Hearing at home, the differences which they have occasioned, need never have been divulged abroad. And though not without difficulty they were, afterward, brought to an Hearing at *Drawell* (where, I suppose, thou thy self, who wast there present, wilt not deny but they had a full and a fair Hearing) yet so far have they been from abiding the advice and judgment of that Meeting, that they have not abidden by their own paper of Condemnation, which they gave in at that Meeting. But in this part, *William*, thy discourse is contradictory: for here thou saist, *The abused Parties readiness to abide an Hearing——would not be accepted;* and yet in page 12. thou tellest us, *G. F. submitted to a limited Meeting with thee, &c.* It is therefore a great piece of injustice, *William*, in thee, and an indication of an envious mind, to liken Friends to the Persecuting Jews, who desired judgment of the Civil Magistrate against *Paul*, and that unto Death, before he had seen his Accusers face to face, and had licence to answer for himself; since thou very well knowest that *J. S.* and *J. W.* had their Accusers face to face at *Drawell*, had a fair Hearing and full liberty to Answer for themselves (the Meeting continuing about four daies) and that they were judged by that Meeting, and did also condemn themselves then, though they have since sought to evade the same.

Sett. 4. In the ninth Page of thy Preface, thou saist, *John Story in publick Meeting for worship, hath been accused for a false Prophet; and that when the Accuser hath been desired to prove him so, the Answer*

swer hath been, He is of a dividing Spirit, and therefore a false Prophet. But when (saist thou) in answer it hath been said, Bring forth, and prove matter of evil Fact, or false Doctrine against him, and we will disown him, then nothing (thou saist) of that nature hath been brought forth, much less proved against him. In this thou gloriest not a little, calling often in thy Book for matter of evil Fact, and representing Friends, far short of the Justice, which appeared in Festus, when he directed the Jewish Informers against Paul, to accuse him of Wickedness, if there be any in him. First, let me put thee in mind, William, that in these words of Festus which thou hast quoted, Acts 25. 5. there is nothing for Wickedness in the Greek. The words are [*οτι ουδεν εις τω καινοις τοις*] If there be any thing in this man. But secondly, I wonder thou shouldst say, That nothing of evil Fact hath been then brought forth against J. S. and yet at the same time confess he was charged to be of a dividing Spirit: Is not causing Divisions, and making discord amongst God's People, matter of evil Fact in thy judgment? Sure it was in the Apostle Paul's, and such as he judged a sufficient ground to disown upon: for he exhorts the Saints to mark them which cause Divisions and Offences, contrary to the Doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them, Rom. 16. 17.

Sett. 5. In the Tenth Page thou art big with conceit, and canst not forbear breaking out into a Brag, no less foolish than false. Thou speakest of some that sometimes affirm, That a good Cause may be ill managed; and a bad Cause well managed, thereby insinuating (saist thou) into ignorant people, that though John Story, and his Friends have managed their Cause well, whilest their Opposers have managed their Cause but ill! yet that J. S. and his Friends are persons of bad Spirits, and their Opposers persons of right Spirits. Be it that they are so. But far be it from any to imagine that you have managed your Cause well, unless managing a Cause with fraud and falsehood be managing a Cause well. However, William, since thou art in such a bragging vain, and wilt needs take occasion from what thou saist others have affirmed, to crack of the well managing of your Cause, thou must even take it as it falls, and remember that in those words, which thou reportest some to have affirmed, The ill management relates to a Good Cause; and the well management relates to a Bad Cause. And when thou hast thereupon considered, That thou hast lost more by an implicit Concession that your Cause is bad, than thou art like to gain

gain by pretending to have managed it well, Crack on, at that rate, as long as thou wilt.

Sett. 6. In the same Page thou saist, *If living well, and holding forth nothing but sound Doctrine, shall not be brought to the measuring line of Christ; what defence can there be against a slanderous Tongue?* I perceive thou art willing to take for granted, that *J. S.* and *J. W.* have lived well: But that's a Question, *William*, which may be sooner beg'd than proved. Living well comes under a twofold Consideration. 1. In a strict and proper sense. 2. In a common sense. The former is a life to God: the latter, a life to men. 1. Living well in a strict and proper sense, excludes all the works of the Flesh; neither can any man strictly and properly be said to live well, in whom the works of the Flesh are brought forth. But since *Envy, Strife, Wrath, Hatred, Variance, &c.* (which are the works of the Flesh, *Gal. 5.*) have been so eminently lived in, and brought forth by *J. S.* and *J. W.* it cannot be granted that they have lived well, as living well is (and ought to be) understood in a strict and proper sense, and according to the high Character thou hast given of them; the fruit they have brought forth manifesting the Tree not to be good. 2. Living well in a common sense, is a shunning the gross and foul pollutions of the World. Amongst men of the World, they are said to live well, to be of a good life and conversation, that are not debauch'd and vicious in their Morals, Profane, Corrupt and depraved in manners. But living well in this sense, *William*, will not answer thy design to prove *J. S.* and *J. W.* men of right Spirits and faithful Ministers of Christ: for such a life the Pharisees of old did, and Hypocrites at this day may, attain unto. This being premised to explain the Terms, I now repeat thy Sentence, which is this, *If living well and holding forth nothing but sound doctrine, shall not be brought to the measuring line of Christ, what defence can there be against a slanderous Tongue?* To this first, by Retortion, I oppose, If living well (in the common acception) and holding forth nothing but sound Doctrine, shall be taken for the only measuring line in all cases, how shall the Hypocrite be discovered? *Secondly*, I answer, That where the life and conversation is impeached, there living well (well proved) is a good defence; and so is holding forth nothing but sound Doctrine, where one is charged with holding forth unsound Doctrine. But where one is charged with being of a wrong Spirit, there to alledge living well and holding forth nothing but sound Doctrine, is not a sufficient and adequate Plea: Because experience

hath taught, that some, who have been of a wrong and dividing Spirit, have lived well (as living well is commonly taken) at least for a time: And Reason perswades, that a wrong Spirit, whatever unsound Doctrines it may hold, will (at least for a while) hold them in, and politickly forbear holding forth any thing but sound Doctrine, that so it may be taken (as every wrong Spirit desires to be) for the right Spirit, and have thereby more advantage and opportunity to seduce. Living well therefore, and holding forth nothing but sound Doctrine, shall be brought to the measuring line of Christ; and if found to hold measure by that line, will be a good defence against that Tongue that shall slander the Conversation or Doctrine. But since a wrong Spirit may lurk and shelter it self under living well (in the common sense) and holding forth nothing but sound Doctrine, it must be a more spiritual line, than that of a fair outside only, whether in Life or Doctrine, by which a Spirit must be tryed and measured, viz. The Unction from the Holy One, 1 John 2. 20. The Anointing received of him, *vers.* 27.

But because, *William*, thou seemest to lay so great stress upon living well, and holding forth nothing but sound Doctrine, and that not only here but elsewhere, as in Part 1. p. 29. where speaking of Testimonies arising against a dark, separate Spirit, thou saist, *This comes to be spread abroad, as a Seal to that which cannot be evidenced either by Doctrine or Conversation; as if the Tree were not now to be known by its Fruit, as in daies past.* And a little lower in the same Page, *Had they not entertained unrighteous jealousie, we are perswaded, that they would not have testified against such, as have approved themselves unto us no other than faithful Ministers of Christ, sound in Doctrine, and as blameless in Conversation (so far as ever we knew) as any Friends.* And in page 9. of thy Preface, cryest out, *Bring forth, and prove matter of evil Fact, or false Doctrine against him, (viz. J.S.) and we will disown him.* As if soundness of Doctrine, and blamelessness of Conversation, or living well (in the common sense) were an unquestionable ground of Unity and infallible mark and token, not only of being a Member of the Church, but of a faithful Minister of Christ also. Now, *William*, that thou, and others, may see the contradiction, and confusion of thy work, I will spread before thee some other passages which I have noted in thy Book. In the first Part, page 2. thou saist, *In the daies past, we walkt together in true Fellowship each with other, and that in the sensible feeling of that immortal life, whereby we with them*

them were knit and united together, — having the evidence of such one heavenly Union; springing from that, which neither the carnal Eye, nor the carnal Ear, could be witnesses of. What was this, William? Was this only living well and holding forth nothing but sound Doctrine? The carnal Eye and carnal Ear could be witnesses of life and doctrine. But this which thou confessest was then the evidence of our Heavenly Union, was it seems beyond their reach. Again, page 24, 25. Thou saist, *We (who had believed in the light of our Lord Jesus Christ, and had the Evidence in our selves, that we were of the true Brotherhood, and Members of Christ's Body) were at a loss infallibly to manifest unto others, by any outward Marks or Tokens, that we were in reality Members of the true Church, &c.* Why what was the matter? I hope ye were not wanting then of living well, and holding forth nothing but sound Doctrine. And would not those outward Marks or Tokens infallibly manifest unto others then, that ye were in reality Members of the true Church? How is it then that ye urge them now with so much earnestness, and rely on them with so much confidence? Again, Part 3. page 27. Thou saist, *rise evident, That the most certain and infallible marks of Membership in Christ's Body, are invisible to the outward man, though felt and known to the inward man of the heart.* But sure, living well, and holding forth nothing but sound Doctrine, are not invisible to the outward man; and consequently these (which thou so much insistest on, as Arguments that J. S. and J. W. are not only Members but faithful Ministers of Christ) are not the most certain and Infallible works of Membership in Christ's Body. But in the next page, thou goest further, for there thou saist, *Though actions outwardly just, are many times the fruit of the Spirit; yet are not always certain Tokens, that those through whom they appear, are Members of Christ's Body.* Again, page 83. Thou saist, *I therefore do reasonably conclude, that the infallible mark, whereby any Member of the Body is known to be in true Unity with the Body, doth not consist in profession and belief of certain Principles and Doctrines, and Practices depending thereon.* This I take to comprehend both living well, and holding forth nothing but sound Doctrine: for surely a Profession and belief of certain Principles and Doctrines contains the one, and Practices depending thereon, implies the other. But these thou concludest (and reasonably too, thou saist) not to be the infallible work, whereby any Member of the Body is known to be in true unity with the Body. Again, page 84. *The most infallible Mark and Token then (thou saist) of a Member in the true unity with the Body*

of Christ, is an inward invisible mark that cannot be stamp'd on any, but by the impresson of God's power, on the heart. Yet once more, Part 1. page 12. speaking of some being admitted to be Members of Meetings, that did but so much as profess the Truth, and appear in the outward form thereof, and were not then of scandalous conversations; you say, *All which might appear in such as were far remote from witnessing the Circumcision of the Heart, and the Answer of a good conscience towards God, which must be witnessed as the proper product of the Baptism of the Spirit, before a possession of the Truth be known.* The inconsistency of these with thy former sayings, will (I doubt not) be obvious to every considerate Reader; and if any, by these fruits, should measure thy Spirit (according to the method thou hast propos'd) they could not but judge it an erroneous Spirit, that is Author of so much contradiction and confusion. But to return to the Preface. In page 11. thou carpest at G. F. for sending a Certificate to some Friends of Hartford, concerning John Story's encouraging the Separate Meeting, and writing that *they may shew it both to Enemies and Friends.* But by Enemies here, William, is not meant the Worlds people; but such as thy self and many more, who in words profess Truth, but being joyned to and acted by that Spirit that opposes Truth, though they pretend to be and would pass for Friends of Truth, are notwithstanding indeed and in Truth the worst Enemies that Truth hath.

Sett. 7. Another snapt thou hast at G. F. for writing in a Letter thus, *And you that have given your Testimony against that Spirit, stand in your Testimony till they answer by Condemnation; and do not strive and make bargains with that which is out of the Truth.* Here thou huntest about with thy [Ifs] to see if thou canst find any mischievous Meaning to put upon G. F.'s words; and that which comes first to hand is this, *If his meaning be, that he would not have Friends discourse with such, nor yet to agree about any orderly Conference, in order to a Reconciliation, or hearing of differences, then his own Practice afterward, in submitting to a limited Meeting with me, — condemns his own direction.* Any thing, William, but an Evil mind (which alwaies takes pleasure in taking things in the worst sense) would rather have used his condescending to that Meeting; as an Argument that this was not his meaning. Thou addest, *Besides, such a meaning from the great Apostle of Christ (which, in a scoff thou saist, doubtless G. F. is at least reputed by many to be) seems wholly repugnant to the counsel of the Apostle Jude, verse 3, 4.*

But

But here first let me tell thee, that thy flout at G. F. is very unfavoury, and manifests an *Ishmaelitish* Spirit in thee, *Gen. 21. 9.* As for G. F. an honourable Instrument hath the Lord made him, and set him above the reach of this flouting Envy.

Secondly, As to Conferring, Discoursing, &c. with such as are gone out of Truth, There are times and seasons to Confer, Discourse, Dispute, Reason, &c. and there are times and seasons to Judge, Reprove, Condemn, &c. And the seasons for each are in the Father's hand; and the Children, standing in the Counsel of the Father, receive from him an understanding, to know, discern, and lay hold of the proper season for each. And though many endeavours, in the love of God, have been used to reclaim some from their Errors, to recover some out of the Snare, and to convince others of their Folly; yet if there should no further Progress be made in that method; but only Judgment fix'd upon the Head of this gain-saying Spirit, and its Adherents, there would be no repugnancy at all therein, to the Counsel of the Apostle Jude, nor to his Practice neither. Read his Epistle, and tell me, whether he contended against those ungodly Men by Conferring with them, or by *fixing the judgment of Truth upon them.* He not only calls them *ungodly men*, Verse 4. *Filthy Dreamers*; Verse 8. *Corrupters of themselves, as brute Beasts*, Verse 10. but denounces *Wo unto them for their Envy and Gain-saying*, Verse 11. He calls them *Spots, Empty Clouds, Fruitless, dead Trees*, Verse 12. *Raging Waves of the Sea, foaming out (as you have done) their own shame; wandering Stars*; and again denounces a most dreadful Judgment upon them, *To whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever*, Verse 13. He calls them *Murmurers, and Complainers*, Verse 16. *Mockers*, Verse 18. *Sensual Separatists*, Verse 19. who not having the Spirit, then did (as some now do) oppose the work of the Spirit, and them that were led by it. What thinkest thou, *William*, was this such contending as he Counsell'd? Or did he counsel one thing and practice another? Then as to the other Counsel, thou mentionest of Paul to Titus, that *Gain-sayers were to be convinced by sound Doctrine and Exhortation*: That shews, They were rather to be Preached to, than conferred with. And besides, it appears, Those Gain-sayers were to be *Rebuked sharply*, Tit. 1. 13. and *with all Authority*, Chap. 2. 15. Thus have I endeavoured to shew thee, both that this first Meaning thou hast given to G. F.'s words is wrong and groundless; and also that if it had really been his meaning, it had not been repugnant to the Apostle's Counsel.

Now

Now it seems thou didst not think it safe to trust to thy first [*If*] and therefore beatedst about till thou hadst started a second [*If* ;] and not content with two [*Ifs*] thou settest thy restless thoughts on work, to find out a third if thou couldst ; so eager thou wert to fasten some evil meaning upon G. F. But it is pretty to observe that thou art forced to confess [*A third I cannot think of.*] However, I perceive thou art resolved to make the best (or rather the worst) of that thou hast thought of, as 'tis probable thou didst endeavour to think as bad as thou couldst. Thou bringest in G. F's meaning thus, page 13. *But if otherwise G. F's meaning be, that such whom he condemns, have no right to Bargain, Buy or Sell, until they answer by condemnation ; then I may justly term that, to be a mark of the Beast, spoken of Rev. 13. 17.* But, *William*, what if this be not G. F's meaning ? May we not then justly term this a *Beastly insinuation of thine* ? Can all the infernal Spirits invent a readier and fouler way to defame a man, than to devise the most obnoxious meanings for his words, and then load him with all the ill consequences of those Meanings ? Yet this is the Course thou hast here taken with G. F. suggesting such a meaning to his Words, as nothing could be more remote from them, and which nothing but engaged malice could surmise. For had G. F's words any relation to Buying and Selling ? had they any respect to Worldly or Temporal Affairs ? Ah, *William*, thy envy and injustice are here so obvious, that indeed I hardly think thou couldst have given a more demonstrative evidence, to every Reader, of the wickedness of that Spirit, which prompted thee thus to write. Thou saist, *Let the Reader take either of these meanings, and 'tis the mark of a Deceiver, &c.* Thou matters not, it seems, which of them he takes, so he takes one, though thou mightst well know they were both false. But the Devil hath deceived thee, and hath brought upon thy self that Reproach which thou hast so laboured to cast upon another : For while thou hast been talking of the Mark or name of the Beast, thou hast discovered in thy self the nature of him.

Sett. 7. In the same pag. thou hintest the Reason of thy publishing this Preface to be, *That so the Reader from the Preface, may have a little Savour of that Spirit, by which the Opposers of the Children of Light are led.* The Opposers of the Children of Light, *William*, are thy self and thy Party, who being gone from the Light, are ever and anon, throughout your Book, pleading want of sight, not seeing, want of clearness, and the like. But the Reader, no question

question (if he be a Child of Light) will from thy Preface have more than a little Savour, that thou that Writest it, wast therein led and acted by a Spirit of Darknel and Confusion, in opposition to the Light, and in enmity to the Children thereof, who live therein.

But it seems, *William*, for all thy high pretences to concern of Conscience, and constraint of Spirit, to Write; the thing did not rise originally in thy self, but thou wert put upon it by others at first. This is manifest from thy own words, *pag. 15.* where thou sayest, *This being several times Treated on by some, I was desired (and at length it became my concern of Conscience) to put Pen to Paper on that Subject; which accordingly I did, until at length I compleated an Historical Manuscript, consisting of three parts.* How long it was, after thou hadst been thus desired, before thou didst put Pen to Paper, is not exprest. But if by computation of times it may be lawful to guess at it, I cannot think thou wert very backward in answering their desire, after once thou wast set on. For it was it seems in the year 78. that differences were so publicly manifested, as to burden some of thy Brethren; and after that, they came to be concerned, that the things which became their burden, might be stated in Writing; and after that, this matter was several times treated on among you, before thou wast pitch'd upon for the Champion: And yet I find thy Historical Manuscript, though consisting of three parts, was not only compleated, but prepared (which I take to be Transcribed, or Copied out fair, in order to be sent abroad) by or about the beginning of the year 79. For the letter thou tellst us was written to G. F. about it, after the Manuscript was prepared, bore Date (thou sayest) the 22d. of 2d. Month 79. so nimble and expeditious thou wast in the work, though it was long before it became thy concern of Conscience: For that came but *at length*; and at length too (and probably the same length,) thy Tripartite Manuscript was compleated.

Sett. 8. I willingly pass over many of thy pages, which are chiefly stufft with Revilings of G. F. that I might not dwell upon thy Preface. But in the 29th and 30th pages, I met with that which I cannot let pass without a just Reproof. Thou sayest, *'Tis hoped, that this Treatise may become a warning to many* (and so no doubt it will, to beware of that Spirit by which it was written) *but more especially* (thou sayest) *to such as have departed from the Anointing in themselves, that they may repent, and turn to their first Love, viz.*
The

The appearance of Christ by his Light in them; and not (in neglect of God's Teachings) lye doting on outward Orders; As if that which was promised to be written in the Heart, were now to be sought after in pieces and scraps of Paper. This, William, is Rude, Unfavoury and Horribly-Irreverent Language, Reflecting upon the Writings of the New Testament (for they were written since that Promise, Of writing the Law in the Heart, Jer. 31.33. was made) as well as on what is written at this day. It strikes as directly at the Epistles of Council, Advice, Instruction, Information and Direction given by the Apostles, as at what is given forth, to the same ends, by Friends in this day. The Writings of the Apostles proceeded from the Law written in the heart, and were agreeable thereto, and wereto be Read, Received and-Observed by those to whom they were written; and this was not called Doting on outward Orders, by any that pretended to a Christian Spirit; nor were the Epistles of the Apostles called pieces and scraps of Paper, as thou in an Unchristian Scoffing Spirit, hast here contemptibly called the Writings of Faithful Friends, though given forth by the same Spirit which they were given forth by; as they who have not lost the Spiritual Savour will acknowledge. But in this thou hast manifested a foul Spirit, that to gratifie an Envious mind, regards not what it Reviles, nor where it flings its dirt.

Sett. 9. In pag. 32. Pretending to give a Reason for thy Treating on Principles and Doctrines, thou layest, The Deportment of some unruly Women, and ignorant self-conceited Men, on the part of our Opposers, in publick Meetings for Worship of God, hath frequently been cause of stumbling to some; so that 'tis to be doubted, that Jealousies have been ready to enter many, that though the Name of Christianity is retained amongst the people called Quakers; Yet that the Nature, Life, and Doctrine thereof hath suffered shipwrack amongst them, if all (under that Name) ought at this day to be measured, by the Deportment and Doctrine of some. Upon this, William, I observe,

- 1. That thy Charge of Unruliness in Women, and Ignorance and Self-conceit in Men, being so general as it is, looks more like a Slander than a Truth.*
- 2. But if it were true of some, yet thou well knowest, that All (under the Name Quakers) ought not at this day to be measured by the Deportment, and Doctrine of some: And therefore thy insinuating such a thing with an If, discovers a readiness and willingness of mind in thee, to impute the weakness or miscarriages of some to the whole, if thou mightest.*
- 3. If thou*

didst apprehend the Nature, Life and Doctrine of Christianity hath so far suffered shipwrack amongst the people called *Quakers*, as that thou thoughtest it needful to revive (as thou wordst it) a Testimony unto the Principles of Truth, &c. How came it to pass, that thou and thy party, whom thou represents as stedfast Adherers to and Perseverers in the way of the Spirit of Life, &c. Have never fell upon us for making shipwrack of the Nature, Life and Doctrines of Christianity, and have made those great and *weighty* things the ground of your Contention, rather than such things as you account *little*, light and inconsiderable. Now that ye have not done so, though there needs no other Evidence than what thou thy self gives, *Pres. pag. 23.* Where thou sayst, *Great part of the Contention of one Party with another, seems to be but about the Shell, and not the Kernel.* Yet to put it out of all doubt, one of the Chief of thy Party, *John Wilkinson*, in his Letter to G. F. which thou hast Printed in the 4th Part of thy Book, *pag. 77.* Says positively, *God hath manifested to him, That the Cause of the breach of the Concord we once had, is not in Principles of Truth, nor in Christs Doctrine.* So that this Suggestion of thine appears to be a designed Slander, without ground; and thy own words, if well considered, import thou hadst no ground: For thou dost not say *Jealousies have entered many*, but have been *ready to enter many*. Thy reviving Testimony was intended it seems for preventing Physick, though had the Jealousy been so *ready to enter*, as thou pretendest, it might have come too late. Besides, I observe, thou darst not be *Positive* that such Jealousies have been *so much as ready to enter*, but slidest it in with a [*tis to be doubted*]; as thou dost also in the first part of thy Book, *pag. 69.* where the same matter with some variation, is repeated. At this rate, whensoever thou hast a mind to revive thy Testimony, (which I assure thee is *dead enough*, and wherein thou hast shewed thy self as ignorant and self-conceited, as any thou hast complained of) thou hast no more to do, but to *suppose a doubt*, that Jealousies have been *ready to enter many*. (Therby filling peoples minds with such Jealousies, as thou hast a desire should enter many) and thereupon not only insinuate that, though the Name of Christianity is retained amongst the people called *Quakers*, yet that the Nature, Life and Doctrine thereof hath suffered shipwrack amongst them; but in pursuance of thy Title, as an Evidence that the

Quakers are Apostatized, publish this in Print to the view of the World.

For that is the Meridian, *William*, for which thy Book is Calculated. And whatever may be pretended, it is manifest it was designed and intended for the Worlds view. This may be sufficiently evidenced from it self. For when it says, Preface pag. 30. and 1 Part, pag. 57. *This Treatise is chiefly intended for the Service of the People called Quakers*, That plainly implies it is intended also for the service of the World. Again pag. 35. thou sayst, *If such as are seeking after the way of Truth, amongst the People called Quakers, ——— shall but seriously ponder this Treatise, it may become a means unto such to eschew the evil and embrace the good, by inclining their hearts unto the Principles of Truth herein held forth, &c.* So that here thy Book is recommended to be seriously pondered by such as are but seeking after the way of Truth, not acquainted with it; such whose hearts are not yet inclined to the Principles of Truth, but are to be thereunto inclined by it. In the first part of thy Book, pag. 69. Thou intimatest the design of it to be, *That a door may be opened again both to Professors and Profane.* In the second part, pag. 6. (and frequently elsewhere) thou raisest an Objection against the Light within, from the Principle, and (as it were) in the person of some of the Worlds people; and thy Answer thereto seems to be designed to convince the World of the Principle of the Light within. And in the third part, pag. 13. Speaking of Contentions and Divisions, thou sayest, *The knowledge whereof being no longer to be hid, hath more vigorously occasioned the bringing forth of our Treatise, Intituled, The Christian Quaker, &c. That so all may know, &c.* I could bring more Instances of this: But these I am perswaded are sufficient to perswade any indifferent man, that thy Book was designed for the view of the World; which, hadst thou not been of the Spirit of the World, thou never wouldst have done.

Sett. 10. In the 33th. pag. of the Preface, Thou speakest of *Some* who (thou sayest) have been pleased to Stigmatize other with these Terms, viz. *Dark, leavened, rending, dividing, separating*, and those, who (thou sayest) have so Stigmatized others, thou callest *Lovers of Prebeminence, Innovators and unskilful Preachers, that know not how to divide the Word aright.* But

the 1st part of your Book pag. 16. Thou and the rest concerned with thee therein, *Do Stigmatize others with the very same Terms of dark seperate, rending, dividing Spirit.* Methinks therefore you should be content to take what you give, *To wear your own Badge,* and acknowledge your selves to be lovers of Preheminence, Innovators and Unskilful Preachers, that know not how to divide the Word aright.

Self. 1. In pag. 36. Thou inveighest most bitterly against some, who, (if thou mayest be Credited) have published such Doctrines as these, *viz. Have your Eye to the Brethren.* If you do not see your selves, follow us that do. And frequently exhort to shut out the reasoning, the wisdom and the jealousy without distinction. And to this thou opposeth these Sayings, *Wisdom is justified of her Children. Look not unto us, but unto the Lord. Take heed unto the Light of Christ in your own Consciences. Draw water out of your own Wells; let it be your own and not anothers.* Now though I have little reason to credit thy Evidence, who seemest not to regard what thou sayest of those thou Writest against, yet supposing it to be so that any have said, *Have your Eye to the Brethren,* &c. I have this to say concerning it, there is no hurt in having an Eye (so it be a good, not an evil Eye) to the Brethren: For though none is to look unto them for Life and Salvation, but unto the Lord only; yet it is not only lawful, but commendable in some, to be Followers of the Brethren, as they are followers of Christ. So taught the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 4. 16, 17. *Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me.* For this Cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved Son, and Faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach every where in every Church. And again chap. 11. 1. *Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.* And indeed, in vain had the Apostles, both Paul and Peter, exhorted the Elder, both men and women in the Church, to be Examples and patterns to the Younger, (as we read they did, Phil. 3. 17. 1 Tim. 4. 12. Titus 2. 7. 1 Thess. 5. 7. and 2. 14. 1 Pet. 5. 3.) if it had been Evil, to have an Eye to the Brethren in the Truth. For how should they have followed those good Examples, if they had not seen them? Or how should they have seen them, if they might not have an Eye unto them? Nor doth this saying [*Have an Eye to the Brethren*] any way

interfere with those Sayings which thou hast set against it, any more than the Apostles saying, *Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ*, which implied having an Eye unto him, since none could rightly follow him, but they must see how he walked: Yet none I suppose will say that the Apostles exhorting the Believers to be followers of him, had any tendency to take them off from taking heed unto the Light of Christ in their own Consciences, from drawing water out of their own Wells, or to hinder them from looking unto and following the Lord. And for the other Sentence, [*Wisdom is justified of her Children*], though it seems not pertinent to thy purpose, yet it is undoubtedly true, both that Wisdom is justified of her Children, and that her Children are justified also of her, notwithstanding all thy vain endeavours to find matter of *Condemnation* against them. Which where thou canst not find, thou dost not stick to forge; as in the first page of thy *Postscript*, where speaking of the *Blind Zealot*, whom thou describest to be one that is *principled to Eye the Brethren*, thou addest, *instead of the Light in himself*. But treading on the Scurrility of the Expression [*Blind Zealot*] *William*, Dost thou know any that is so Principled? Thou affirmest thou hast heard some say in Meetings, *Have your Eye to the Brethren*; and pretendest too to know their meaning (for thou sayest, *Meaning thereby publick Preachers*) But didst thou ever hear any of them say either in Meetings or out, *Have your Eye to the Brethren*, instead of the Light in your selves? Or didst thou ever hear any body say, they were Principled to have an Eye to the Brethren, instead of the Light in themselves? Be plain, *William*, and speak the Truth, though thou shamest thy self. If thou hast heard any one so Declare, conceal him not: But if thou hast not heard any one so Declare, *Blush* (if thou art not past Blushing, at thy own Dishonesty, in publishing so foul a Falshood, which nothing but blind Envy could suggest. But for all thy great Outcry, (not only here, but frequently in thy Book) against *Having an Eye to the Brethren*: In the second part pag. 39. thou sayst, *I cannot but testify that those whose understandings have been so enlightened, have alwaies had a regard unto every Instrument, through which the Conscience hath been awakened to close with that Appearance in themselves*. What differs this, I would fain know, from having an Eye to the Brethren, who are really Instrumental in God's hand, to awaken

awaken the Conscience, to close with the appearance of the light of Christ in themselves, as *J. Wilkinson* confesses *G.F. was to him and others*, Part 4. page 77. Dost thou not plainly see here, that what thou exclaimest against others for publishing, thou thy self (in effect) hast published ? And in Part 3. page 12. Thou and the rest concerned with thee, speaking of Strife and Contention being entered, say, *Which doubtless may (if it hath not already) occasion many honest simple-hearted Friends thus in their Hearts to say [Where are the People whom we shall now follow :]* So that it seems you reckon'd, Honest simple-hearted Friends might follow a people, though you count it so horrible a thing for any to have an Eye to the Brethren. But how do you think those honest simple-hearted Friends should follow a People, if they might not have an Eye to them they would follow ? Would you have them follow blindfold ? For my part, *William*, I believe thou hast (of late years) had thy Eye as much to the Brethren, as most men ; but it has been an *evil Eye, watching for evil, peeping about for faults*, to spy out the failings or slips of any. But truly I am perswaded it had been better for thee to have had a single honest Eye to the Brethren (not instead of the Light in thy self, but with and in the Light in thy self ;) that so thou mightst have seen the innocency of their Aim, and integrity of their hearts towards God and his People, than thus to rush on in Opposition to them, and to the Lord in them, to thy shame here, and sorrow hereafter.

As for the other two Sentences, viz. [*If you do not see your selves, follow us that do see ;*] and [*Shut out the reasoning, the wisdom and the jealousy without distinction.*] If any one has delivered the former of these, it is probable it was accompanied with some other words which might be explanatory of these, and not left bare and naked, as thou hast here set it down : for I observe thou dost not say, *These very Doctrines* have been published, but *such like Doctrines* as these. And I have the more reason to suspect thou mayst have stript that of what might have guarded it against thy Exception, because thou hast apparently added to the latter those words whereon thou groundest thy Exception, viz. [*without distinction.*] For thou hast so connected those words to the other, without any interpunctuation, or change of Letter, as if thou hadst heard them delivered together (and that frequently too) on this wise, *Shut out the Reasoning,*

soning, the wisdom and the Jealousie without distinction. Yet who can believe that any one exhorting to shut out the Reasoning, the Wisdom and the Jealousie, would expressly add those words [*without distinction:*] for that were to suppose a man would exhort to shut out the *pure* Reasoning, the *divine* Wisdom and the *godly* Jealousie: which as it would be the *height of extravagancy* in any one that should so exhort; so is it little less than the *height of incharity*, for thee to infer from any one's saying (if any one did say) shut out the Reasoning, the Wisdom and the Jealousie, that he intended. *All Reasoning, All Wisdom, All Jealousie*; or any other Reasoning, Wisdom or Jealousie than that which should and ought to be shut out. But of this probably I may have occasion to speak elsewhere.

Sett. 12. However upon these Doctrines (as thou callest them) thou takest occasion to fall very foul upon some reproachfully calling them *Praters rather than Preachers*, upbraiding them with the *lowness* of their condition in the World, and representing them such *whose necessities have seemed to be a bait unto them, to follow for the Loaves*, page 35. Truly, William, I am perswaded this is the first time, that ever any man under the profession of Christianity, *upbraided a Minister of Christ with necessity*. What would thy Charity, I wonder, have thought of Peter, who had *neither Gold nor yet Silver*? Acts 3. 6. Must Christ have no Ministers now adays, but such as have Estates in this World? Or must those whom he calls in a low Estate outwardly, be rejected *because of their low Estate*? and represented as following for the Loaves? *Qua te Dementia cepit*? Whither wilt thou run, William? whither will Rage and Envy carry thee? where shall we at length find thee? In the Fifth Part of thy Book thou *envyest* G. F. upon a supposition that he is Rich: Here thou *disdainest* others upon a pretence, that they are *poor and necessitous*. Like those that one while quarrelled with Christ for his Austerity and Abstinence (*We have piped, said they, and you have not danced*) Matth. 11. 17. Another while charging him with being a *Wine-bibber and a Glutton, a friend of Publicans and Sinners*, Verse 19. Thus dost thou run the extremes, *neither contented full nor fasting*. But this is still the best on't, that all this tends more and more to discover the *falseness* of that Spirit, which thou art guided by.

CHAP. II.

SECT. I. **H**AVING thus run through the Preface, that which comes next, though very preposterously and out of order, somewhat like *the Cart before the Horse*, is a Postscript before the Book ; In the fore-part of which, thy work is (and work thou dost at it, though all in vain) to clear thy self from having endeavoured to *Back-bite* and reproach G. F. and avoided opportunities of meeting him face to face. Truly, *William*, He that shall indifferently read what thou thy self hast written, needs seek no other Evidence but thy own, whereon to find thee Guilty.

For First, As to thy *Back-biting* and reproaching G. F. it is evident that after thou hadst prepared thy Manuscript against G. F. thou wentest about to disperse it both in City and Country. Thou confessest, in page 24. of thy Preface, *Thou travellest in several parts of the Nation, manifesting how thou hadst proceeded towards G. F.* To the same purpose thou speakest again in the 11th page of thy Postscript. In the 5th page, thou saist, *Amongst other places, I came to London, &c.* And in the 12th page again, *Amongst Friends in GENERAL, the Friends at London were before me to visit on this occasion.* And in page 25. of thy Preface it appears, that, having writ a Paper, wherein was inserted, that thou didst charge G. F. to be guilty of things reproachful to the Truth, *thou didst very publicly spread the same abroad, directed to Friends in several Counties.* So that it seems, Here was no small pains taken, in Riding up and down, Travelling to and fro, traversing the Countreys, and visiting the City, to defame G. F. with a Manuscript behind his back ; and where thou thy self, with thy Manuscript, could not reach, there by thy Agents to spread abroad, very publicly, in writing directed to Friends in several Counties, that G. F. was guilty of things reproachful to the Truth. And yet it appears, that before thou hadst done thus, thou didst not send a Copy of thy Manuscript to G. F. himself ; only I find in page 18. of thy Postscript, that in a Letter of the 6th of the 12th Month, 1679. thou

thou saist, *Thou didst acquaint G. F. that thou hadst prepared such a Manuscript for the Press, and that thou signifiedst unto him the matters whereon thou hadst treated; but endeavouredst to excuse thy self from sending him a Copy of thy Manuscript, with this idle and unreasonable shift, That for thee to send him the Copy thereof were unreasonable, because he might (when thou hadst so done) take no more notice thereof, than (thou saist) he had of the four forementioned Letters.* So that it is very manifest, even from thy own acknowledgments, that after thou hadst prepared thy Manuscript against G. F. thou wentest up and down, through City and Country, with it; and not only so, but spreadedst abroad another Paper also, the tendency whereof was to *defame G. F. and very publickly too; and all this before thou hadst sent (if to this day thou hast ever sent) a Copy of thy Manuscript to him.* And if this, so fairly collected from thy own confessions, be not full and sufficient Evidence of thy *Back-biting G. F. and reproaching him behind his Back,* I know not what can deserve to be accounted so.

Sett. 2. Secondly, As to thy avoiding opportunity of meeting him *face to face;* It is evident that when thou Travelledst (as thou saist) in several parts of the Nation, thou knewst beforehand that G. F. was not in any of those Parts, where thou and thy Manuscript Travelled to *defame* him. When thou wert come to London, with design to *bespatter* him throughout the City (as thou hadst done in some Counties where thou couldst get an entrance) thou seemedst very hot and earnest for a Meeting with G. F. (for thou knewst he was then far enough off) but wert told by some (which thou didst not deny) that they understood G. F. would be at the General Meeting. This was about the end of the Twelfth Month 1679. (for thy Letter then written at London to James Claypoole about it, bears date 25th of the 12th Month, 79.) so that it was very little above three Monthsto the General Meeting. At the Yearly Meeting G. F. was in London, and J. C. by Letter acquainted thee so; but thy seeming heat was then so much *abated,* and thy desire so *cooled,* that thou madeest no progress towards it. After this, when thy occasions drew thee to London, James Claypoole thou confessest told thee, that G. F. was but a few Miles out of London (and that, it seems, was at *Hammer-smith,* but five Miles) yet so little sto-

mack

mack hadst thou then to meet G. F. *face to face*, that thou wouldst neither go unto him there, nor stay a few daies till he returned into the City, nor so much as call upon him as thou wentst back, though *Hammersmith* was in thy way home. And if this was not avoiding Opportunities of Meeting him *face to face*, what may we take to be so? I am sure this was not seeking opportunities, nor yet taking them when they lay open. But questionless, *William*, he that in thy own Book shall read, Part 5. page 3. that a little before this G. F. went to *Bristol*, and there voluntarily gave thee a Meeting, in the midst of thy own Party; will find no cause to think G. F. was unwilling to give thee a Meeting.

But I am willing also to weigh what thou offerest in thy Vindication, If I can find any thing *light enough* to weigh against it. First, Thou pleasest thy self (or rather I think wouldst, if thou couldst, perswade thy Reader to please himself) with a Conceit, *That men of Understanding and Impartial, when they should be informed, that the end thou desiredst a Meeting for, was to prove G. F. guilty of things reproachful to the Truth, and that he would by no means assent to such a Meeting, would be ready to conclude, that no Obligation in Truth might be upon thee to take any further notice of him as to a Meeting, &c.* Men of Understanding, and Impartial, are not so easily imposed upon, *William*; but if they should, yet when they should come to see that, and understand that that Information is *false* (as it is) and contrived on purpose to deceive, I am perswaded they would be as ready to conclude, that he that so informed them was *none of the Honestest*. And that the Information was false they might easily understand even from this very *Postscript*: For though part of thy Information here be, that G. F. would *by no means* assent to such a meeting; yet in *pag. 24.* thou confessest a Friend from *London* advised thee, that *W. M.* desired *N. Lucas*, that it might be intimated to thee, that G. F. would give thee a Meeting. And the only Trick by which thou didst evade it, was because he (who had been so often abused by thee) would not give it under his hand to thee, nor write to thee. So that, by thy own acknowledgment, here was a Meeting *assented to* by G. F. which proves thy Information false, in saying he would by *no means* assent to such a Meeting. Yet from this false Information, that G. F. would by no means assent to such a Meeting, thou takest it for granted,

granted, that Understanding and Impartial men would conclude that no Obligation in Truth lay on thee to take any further notice of him as to a Meeting, had it so happened, that thou hadst accidentally met in the very Street, much less Ride 94 Miles upon bare Report from the said J. B. that he was in London; as if thy business were the business of such a poor Pensioner, that had nothing to do, but to attend G. F.'s motion. Indeed, William, I am loth to entertain so much as a mean Thought of thy business in Trade, much less to drop a single Syllable that might seem to represent it any whit diminutive: Yet when I consider in how little time thou (if there were not many hands to make light work of it) hast compiled a Book of that Bulk, (constraining I suppose about 90 Sheets) And when I read how thou hast travelled up and down (to publish thy Manuscript against G. F.) in several parts of the Nation, it would almost tempt a man ~~wisely~~ to believe, that in those times thou hadst not much business to do; however to be sure if thou hadst, thou mightest have been much better employed. But what meanest thou, William, to call James Claypool's Letter a bare Report? Did he write that it was Reported G. F. was in London? Or did he positively affirm he was in London then? Dost thou think Understanding and Impartial men will not see this to be one of thy needy shifts, to excuse thy coming up, by insinuating that thou hadst no certainty of G. F. being there, but only a bare Report from J. C. Or canst thou imagine Understanding and Impartial men will not see the emptiness of thy alledging; thou must have ridden 94 Miles, and have left thy throng of business to meet G. F. face to face, when they shall have considered, that thou hadst ridden without regret (in probability many a 94 Miles (how thronging soever thy business then was) to bespatter G. F. behind his back? Ah! William, these thin excuses and Tiffany-pretences are easily seen through. And yet these I take to be the most weighty thou urgest: For though thou pretendest to give two Reasons more, a first, and a secondly, yet the first is but giving the Lye to thy Opponent (a Vice thou art to Subject too, and which, whatever thou mayst think of it, does not at all commend thy Breeding.) Thy words are there, *First then, I must tell thee evil Insinuations, who say, that I had no desire to meet G. F. when I writ to him of my readiness so to do, that therein they be-lye me.* And this thou addest for the sakes of others, as thou sayst, *To clear the matter*

matter objected somewhat more. A strange method, one would think, of clearing things, by telling Folks they be-lye them. Yet this is the length and breadth of thy first Reason. And thy second is but a Repetition of what thou hadst said before, of Riding 94 Miles to London, out of all the Throng of other occasions, on *J. Claypooles* notice that *G. F.* is, or will be at London; with this addition in this place, *That this indeed will be a very ready way to bring outward blasting, according to the Prophecies of some of thy Opposers.* O what a many Considerations will present themselves to stop a Journey that a man has no mind to take! The length of the way, 94 Miles, a long and tedious Journey indeed to meet *G. F. Face to Face*, though twice or perhaps thrice so much was little, light and easie (born through upon the wing of Envy) to *Slander him behind his back*. Other occasions, it seems too, came thronging in opportunely upon thee, to detain thee from going to meet *G. F. Face to Face*: Though thou couldst press through all the Throng of thy other occasions, and take as much liberty from business (if I may use thy own phrase without offence) as *any Poor Pensioner*, not only to Compile thy Book (for since *others will not own it*, 'tis but reason that thou whose name is (I think) to every part of it, shouldst have the *discredit* of being (at least) the chief Author of it) but also to ride 94 Miles to London, and Traverse the Country too, Travelling in several parts of the Nation, to *Calumniate G. F. behind his back*. And to block up the way on every side, the Consideration too, it seems, fell in, of this being a ready way to bring *outward blasting*, if, neglecting thy business, thou shouldst have gone to meet *G. F. face to face*: Though nothing of this kind was thought of, or of force, when thou wentest with thy Manuscript through City and Country, to *traduce G. F. behind his back*; as if thou hadst been the most secure from the danger of *outward blasting*, when thou wert spending thy time in endeavouring to *blast* the Credit, good Name and Reputation of another.

But after all this noise and talk, *William*, this empty shew and weak appearance of a Defence, what was (if one may be so bold to ask) the real end, design and aim (next to the *bespattering* of *G. F.*) of thy coming to London and Travelling the Countries, with thy Manuscript? Was it not (in appearance I mean) to ingage all the Interest thou couldst make to per-

swade *G. F.* to give thee a Meeting? Such a shew thy Papers carry. Nay thou seemest to invite Friends to write to *G. F.* about it; and in one of thy Letters (p. 10.) art so condescending as to grant them 20 days time from the date thereof (which was the 25th of the 12th Month 79.) to write to him in; which probably might occasion some to tell thee (as thou ownest they did) that they understood *G. F.* would be at the General Meeting. Now suppose any had been so much at leisure, as upon thy motion to have Writ to *G. F.* and he had signified his full purpose to come up either then or sooner; what wouldst thou have done, *William*, in the case? staid at *London* until he come; or gone home, and come up again when thou knewst he was come? Stay, 'tis probable thou couldst not, unquestionable thou wouldst not: If thou wouldst have gone home, and come up again, that is but the same *J. Claypoole's* Letter imported, and thou refusedst. But since experience shews thou wouldst not stay a day or two in Town, while *G. F.* came from *Hammer-smith*; nor go to him there, though but 5 Miles out of Town, nor so much as call upon him in thy passage; he must be over credulous that can believe thou wouldst either have staid his coming, or come up again when he was come, if any Friend at thy instance had desired him to come. So that in short, *William*, consider thy Case which way one will, there is no shew of *Sincerity*, no appearance of a *real* intention in thy *seeming* earnestness to meet *G. F.* face to Face. And as for what thou cites p. 22. out of a Letter from *D. Smith* of *Marlborough* of the 6th of the 5th Month 80. to prove *G. F.*'s unwillingness to meet thee, it no way proves the Charge at all: For it only says, *That he judg'd it would prove but a jangle, as at Bristol*, which no way proves that he was *unwilling*, or *declin'd* a Meeting, or had *no inclination* to it, much less that he would by *no means* assent to such a Meeting, as thou untruly chargest him. So that Slander and Falshood still lyes at thy door.

Sett. 3. The rest of thy *Postscript*, *William*, is spent with as ill success to thy design: For whereas in it thou labourest to manifest the *righteousness* of thy proceeding to Print; the very Evidence thou bringest to prove thy *Righteousness*, doth apparently convict thee of great *unrighteousness*, deceit and falshood. This having been largely insisted on, as thou knowest, the last Sum-

mer

mer at London, and since (as I understand) effectually handled in another Treatise lately published, I do not think needful to open here, in all its parts. At present therefore I shall only observe, that having in p. 25, 26. of thy *Postscript*, to justify thy own proceeding to Print, affirmed, *That such as have been of Party against you, have been the first (and frequent) Promulgators by Printing, that there have been Divisions amongst the people called Quakers*: To evidence this (in pag. 27.) thou citest a Printed Epistle, containing two Sheets of Paper, given forth by *Ann Whitehead* and *Mary Elson*. Now it must needs, *William*, be obvious to every Impartial Eye, that in instancing this Epistle as an Evidence that Friends (such as, thou sayst, have been of Party against you) were the *first* Promulgators of the Divisions by *Printing*, thy design and drift was to persuade the Reader, that Friends fell first to *Printing*, that they led the way, and by *Printing* that Epistle provoked you to fall to *Printing* too, and so occasioned the *Printing* your Book. But how false this is, and consequently how unrighteous thou art in so pretending, will be as obvious also, when the Reader, from thy own Confession, shall understand, that thy Book was Printed, all the five Parts of it, *Preface* and all, before ever thou hadst seen that Epistle. Which that it was, appears by comparing the 24th and 27th pages of thy *Postscript* together: For in pag. 27. Thou sayst, *On the 8th Instant (which was the 8th of November 1680.) came to my hands two Sheets of Printed Paper, Entituled, An Epistle, &c. Subscribed by Ann Whitehead and Mary Elson. And in pag. 24. Thou sayst, Bristol the 8th of November 1680. Notwithstanding, that ALL this Treatise (excepting the Postscript, Index and Errata) is already Printed.* So that here thou acknowledgest in express words, on the very same day that that Epistle came to thy hand, that all thy Book (except this *Postscript*, the *Index* and *Errata*) was Printed off before that time: Now is not this most horrible unrighteousness, falsehood and deceit, in thee, *William*, to make as if that Epistle had been Printed *before* the Book, and had been a ground of Provocation to thee to Print, when as all the five parts and *Preface* of thy Book, were in Print before that Epistle came to thy hand, and indeed most of it before that Epistle was written.

CHAP. III.

Sett. 1. **H**AVING passed through the *Postscript*, I now enter the Book it self: In Answering which, I must now address my self not to the singly, *William*, as hitherto, but joyntly to all that were concerned with thee in Writing or publishing thy Book. Which through the stile of thy Book obliges me to do; yet I put a difference in my mind (and would be understood soto intend throughout this Answer) between thee with some few of thy Party, and such as by your subtle Insinuations, have through ignorance been betrayed into some little kind of liking of your work, or favouring of your Book; but without that Rancour of mind, that Root of Bitterness and Radicated Malice, which hath appeared in thee and some few of thy Party, who have hardned your selves (I fear) to destruction. But as I am perswaded there are many amongst you, who though beguiled by fair Speeches and colourable pretences, have yet so much tenderness and regard for Truth, as not fully to joyn with you in this your undertaking: So I assure all such I have a tender compassion in my Soul towards them, even while the zeal of the Lord breaks forth as a flame against that destroying Spirit, which some of you have joyned your selves unto. Thus much I was willing here to signifie in tenderness towards them, in whom there is yet some tenderness remaining.

Now to your Book, consisting of five Parts: The first Part and the third, are so near of a Complexion, and there is so much of the one rejected in the other, that to avoid the like fault, of saying the same thing over and over again, I shall pass by many things in that Part, and take notice of them when I come to the third Part. Yet here I cannot but observe, that, as much of this first Part is made up of Objections (and Answers) of your own making; so in framing the Objections you have dealt very disingenuously (I might say dishonestly) with those, in whose Names and Persons the Objections are pretended to be raised. From this part of your Book, where you pretend to

Treat of some part of those things touching which the Faithful were

at unity, and by what ways and means that unity came to be broken (though, by the way, let me tell you, the Faithful are still at unity in those things, and your running out of the unity through unfaithfulness, neither hath broken, nor can break, the unity of the Faithful) the difference lying between Friends and you, the Objections you make against your selves, for your selves to Answer, are designed to betaken for Friends Objections, as if Friends had made them, and therefore they ought to contain no more, nor other, than Friends would have Objected, if they had framed the Objections themselves. But you have contrived your Objections, as *Hicks* the Baptist did his Dialogues, to abuse and misrepresent Friends, and render them as holding such things as they never held. Of many Instances that might be given of this, take one out of your *9th page*, where, in the Objection you have made for Friends, you bring Friends in speaking of G. F. as one, whom the Lord hath ordained to be in that place amongst the Children of Light in this our day, as Moses was amongst the Children of Israel in his day. I deny this to be holden by Friends; prove it if you can. Yet from this suggestion of your own in the Objection, you do in the same *pag.* draw a formal Position, as in Friends Name, That the Lord hath ordained G. F. to be in that place amongst the Children of Light in this our day, as Moses was amongst the Children of Israel in his day. And you bestow a whole Section in confuting this Position. At this rate you may be sure never to want work, nor ways to calumniate and slander whom you please. For 'tis but devising Objections for others, suitable to your own designs. But such kind of dealing, I hope you remember, was accounted Forgery in *Thomas Hicks*: What will ye call it in your selves? Well, well; though at present you may gratify an envious mind by such *Unchristian practices*, you'll find the end of these things will be bitterness of Soul.

Self. 2. In *page 11.* and *12.* you rail at Monthly and Quarterly Meetings being called the Church. This I perceive has offended you highly. But questionless some of you could not but understand, that if those Meetings have at any time been called the Church, it has been by a Synecdoche apart being for the whole, not intending to exclude any that are truly faithful from being of the Church of Christ, though not present at those

those Meetings. And surely, if two or three gathered in the Name of Christ, may rightly be called a Church, it must be very great incharity to think that in a Monthly or Quarterly Meeting there are not so many as two or three so gathered. And since your selves confess, *you dare not conclude, that none in those Meetings were Members of the Church*, what cause have you to quarrel at those Meetings, being called the Church? May not the Members of the Church, when met together in the Name of Christ, be called a Church? what may then? Besides you say, *The Church of God consists properly of such as are by one Spirit Baptized into one Body; and so are in the possession as well as profession of Truth*. Now then, since Monthly and Quarterly Meetings consist properly of such faithful Friends as are by one Spirit Baptized into one Body, and whom it would ill become you that cry out against judging, to judge are not in the possession yet profession of Truth, where (I would fain know) according to your own Notion of the Church, is the hurt or error of calling those Meetings the Church? You say indeed, that *Who ever they were, that did but so much as profess the Truth, were admitted to be Members of such Meetings, whilst they appeared in the outward form thereof, and were not then of scandalous Conversations*. What you intend by saying such were admitted, I know not; If you mean they were not kept out, or thrust out, by force, you know we have no such Custom; If you mean they were allowed of, approved, or their presence desired, it is false; for when any such, as you say were far remote from witnessing the Circumcision of the Heart, and the answer of a good Conscience towards God, have intruded into such Meetings, they have been but a clog and burden to the Meetings, and have often been called out and desired to withdraw; This I am sure some of your Party cannot be ignorant of; and therefore you deal very unfairly to suggest such falsehoods instead of Truth. And you do manifestly abuse Robert Barclay in quoting his Book of Government to countenance your false Charge; For in page 79, and 82. which you cite, He doth not admit such as were far remote from witnessing the Circumcision of the Heart, and the answer of a good Conscience towards God; But he says, page 79. "Do we exclude any Member of the Church of Christ, that may truly be accounted so, to tell his judgment? And in page 82. he saies, "All that in a true sense may be reckoned of the Church, as being

ing *sober and weighty*, may be present, and give their judgment, Do you not see here how safely he hath guarded his Expression; referring it still to such as *may truly be accounted* Members of the Church of Christ, such as in a *true sense* may be reckoned of the Church, such as are not only *sober* but *weighty*? Will this in your sense extend to such as are *far remote from witnessing the Circumcision of the Heart, and the answer of a good Conscience towards God*? If it will, you need say no more to manifest who are the Apostate *Quakers*: If it will not, you have said enough to manifest your selves false Accusers. But if such, as you have here described, should frequent Monthly and Quarterly Meetings (though where I have had opportunities to make Observation, it is not often that such come) would that think you) be a sufficient Reason to say, *those Meetings* (wherein most of the Faithful Friends in the Nation do usually Assemble) *are not the Church of Christ*. Surely then, Friends publick Meetings for Worship of God may much less be called the Church of Christ; for not only such as you here mention, but many of the Worlds people also, do usually (as you very well know) resort to those Meetings. So that the result of your Reasoning will issue in this, that none of Friends Meetings may in Truth be called the Church of Christ. But the judicious Reader no doubt will favour your Spirit in this, and see what it is you drive at. You recommend to the Readers consideration, *Whether mens Meetings have not often consisted of such Members* (namely such, as were far remote from witnessing the the Circumcision of the Heart, and the Answer of a good Conscience towards God) *and are not like so to do, whilst the door is open for any under the aforesaid qualification to sit there, as, you say, it yet is; and this you positively affirm again pag. 76.* But in so saying, *you say not the Truth*: For the door neither yet is, nor ever was open for such to sit there; but the door was and is open for the Faithful Friends in Truth to sit there: And if any that are not so, thrust in at the door, which was and is open for others, that proves not that the door was or is open for them, much less that the Meetings consist of them. Do you reckon that Friends Meetings for the publick Worship of God consist of the Worlds people, because some of the people of the World, the door being open, come in and sit there? Yet upon this false suggestion that mens Meetings have often consisted of

such Members, you recommend a great many more particulars to the Readers Consideration, which you introduce with an *if so*; but your *if so* being *not so*, and your premises false, your deductions therefrom deserve no further consideration, as being of no weight. Yet to let you see how little consistent you are with your selves, in this as well as in other parts of your discourse, I will repeat your 4th Consideration, which in p. g. 13. you set down in these words, *Whether a Plea for such Meetings, to govern in matters relating to Conscience, hath not a tendency to justify Confusion; since according to the reputed Order of such Meetings; none that are to be ruled, are excluded from being Rulers.* In other parts of your Book you frequently charge Friends with *Usurpation, Imposition, &c.* and that *some take upon them to rule over others, to govern others, to exercise* (as you call it) *a Gentilian Lordship over others, and keep others under and in Subjection to them.* And an hideous noise and din you make when you strike upon that string, on which but three or four Lines before you gave a touch, insinuating that *such a Plea hath a tendency to justify Usurpation.* Yet now, that you might impeach our Meetings (as you think) of *Confusion* too, you would render the Government in them reciprocal, that *none that are to be ruled, are excluded from being Rulers.* Where then is that *Cruel Imposition, that Tyrannical Usurpation, that Intolerable Subjection, that Gentilian Lordship* you raise so loud and lewd a Clamour about? 'Tis no wonder you are so hard to be pleased, when you do not know your own minds, nor what it is you would be at; one while crying out against our Meetings, because some (as you say) bear Rule over others, and keep them in Subjection, and exercise Lordship over them, &c. Another while, and almost in the same breath as it were, complaining of the same Meetings, because (as you say) *none that are to be ruled, are excluded from being Rulers.* Doubtless, though you may shut your Eyes, and resolve not to see, yet the Impartial Reader will plainly see how inconsistent you are with your selves, as well as with the Truth; and how ready you are to catch up any thing, which you think might serve you for a Stone to throw at them, that abiding still in Truth are an Eye sore to you that are gone from Truth. But yet further to manifest your Injustice, suppose it as you here say, that *none that are to be ruled, are excluded from being Rulers;* Is this

Confusion? Read then what your selves say but two pages off, pag. 15. *Where these Meetings are assented to, say you, We look'd upon our selves all Servants one unto another.* It seems then, none that were to be served, were excluded from being Servants, to them by whom they were served; nor any that were Servants excluded from being served by them to whom they were Servants. But was this Reciprocation of service *Confusion*? If you say it was, judge your selves for *Confusion*; if you say it was not, judge your selves for your injustice, in calling that *Confusion* in others, which you will not admit to be so in your selves.

Sett. 3. Your Cavil in your 14. pag. shews only a malicious mind, hunting about to find an opportunity to slander. You raise a Query, *What order is either prescribed or used, whereby the sense of such Meetings is collected.* I might hereupon take occasion to ask you, *What order was used in Wiltshire, when some of your unruly Party catcht up the Meeting's Book, and went a way with it to an Inn or Alehouse?* But I chuse rather to take notice of the Answer you make to your own Query. You say, *An eminent Person professing Truth being at Bristol did take occasion to signify, at a Man's Meeting held in that City, to this effect; That in London, and other parts of this Nation, where such Meetings were usually held, the sense of the generality hath been taken for the sence of such Meetings.* What then? If any one did so expreis himself, where lies the evil of it; Where Meetings consist of many faithful Friends, why may not the sense of the Generality of them be taken for the sense of such Meetings, Especially where there is no Opposition, or contrary sense delivered; But this is not that you would be at, you have something else to suggest, which this is but an Introduction to. You say, *Comparing this with this Doctrine frequently of late published amongst us, That the Apostacy shall never enter the Generality more, doth give us just occasion to be jealous, that our Opposers, for the carrying on of their designs against us, have contrived this Method of carrying all things by the generality, or major Number of voices.* Ay, I thought there was something behind, which this Query was designed to usher in. By this then you would insinuate, That the Order prescribed or used by Friends for collecting the sense of such Meetings is by *Voting*, and that Friends have contrived a Method of carrying all things by the generality, or Ma-

major Number of voices. But do you know any Meeting of Friends, in London or else where, wherein any such Order is either prescribed or used, for collecting the sense of the Meeting by voting? or where all things are carried by the *major Number of voices*? and a *Method* too contrived for the doing it? It behooved you to have instanced this, if you could, but instead of being able to do that, you confess in the very next words, that *This limitation* as you call it, that is, *this way of carrying all things by the major number of voices, you know is utterly disowned as contrary to Truth, by the Approvers of Rob. Barclay's, Book of Government, as in pag. 81.* Now had not envy hardened you past shame, with what face could you have thus undertaken to fasten this false suggestion upon Friends, which your selves know and even in the same Period, confess you know, is utterly disowned by Friends!

Sett. 4. In your 18. pag. You say, *he that is not sensible of the danger in running beyond his gift, and is so puffed up with spiritual pride, as to conclude himself more faithful, more holy, circumspet, more discerning than his brother, &c. may easily run himself on this Rock of judging those whom the Lord judgeth not, &c.* Had you been sensible of this danger, you would not have run your selves on this Rock of judging, as you have done, those whom the Lord judgeth not. You would not then have rushed into so general a judgment as you have given in your 15 pag. where you say, *We do firmly believe, that as many of those, who formerly were in the Truth, and do now account us dark Spirits, because we cannot be at Unity with them, in such actions as we account Persecution against Ancient Brethren, are already Apostatized.* But since you have thus headily run your selves upon this Rock of judging the far greatest part of the Friends in the Nation to be already Apostatized, how will ye avoid your own Censure of being *puffed up with Spiritual Pride, &c.*

Sett. 5. Another of your Cavils is about *believing as the true Church believes.* This you cry out most horribly against, as if it were a most dangerous Error to believe as the true Church believes. In pag. 23. you make a Position (which, you say, is deducible from an Objection, of your own framing too) viz. *That 'tis folly and Hypocrisy to profess our selves Members of the true Church, and yet not believe thus as the true Church believes.* And you bestow a whole Section of four pages here, to confute this,

this, besides what is said to it in 3 Part, pag. 74, 75. Now that Position is but part of a Sentence, taken out of a Book written by one (whom you confess is an *Eminent Friend*) in Answer to an *Eminent Apostate* from, and Opposer of Truth and Friends; wherein you have *Eminently Abused* that *Eminent Friend*. His intire Sentence, out of which you crop these words, stands thus (as in another place of your Book you have set it down) "I affirm, that the true Church is in the true Faith that is in God, and we must either believe thus as the true Church believes, or else it were but both a Folly and Hypocrisy to profess our selves Members thereof. By which it appears that that Friend spake expressly of the *True Faith that is in God*; that Faith which is so *Essential to the Being* of a true Church, that neither can any Church be a true Church, nor any one be a Member of the true Church, that is not in some measure in that Faith, *the true Faith that is in God*. But is it not Folly as well as Hypocrisy, for any one to profess himself a Member of the True Church, and yet not be in that Faith, without which it is impossible to be a Member of the True Church? Since then the Particle [*thus*] in your Position, relates to the *True Faith that is in God*, your Position must be understood thus, That 'tis Folly and Hypocrisy to profess our selves Members of the true Church, and yet not be in the true Faith, that is not believe in God, as the true Church believes. And where, I wonder, lies the danger of such a Position? Yet you cry out, *We are altogether dissatisfied* (especially when we consider what a body of darkness hath entred under the belief of this Position [we must believe as the Church believes] amongst the Professors of Christianity in Ages past, as well as at this present day) that such Language can become the Mouth, or Pen of anyone, that professeth not only Faith in Christ, but also that such his Faith is grounded upon the inward manifestation and revelation of Gods Spirit in himself. But what if a Body of Darkness hath entred, under the belief of this Position, while *misapplied* to a false Church; must it therefore be evil to apply this Position aright, to the true Church? If darkness has entred by Professors of Christianity believing as the false Church believed, should that hinder Professors of Christianity from believing as the true Church believes? Doubtless, had not a body of darkness entred you also, you would never have reasoned at this rate. On the same ground you might renounce Christianity it self too, because

so many, that have profess'd it, have made so ill use of it. But this, it seems, is the *special Consideration*, on which you are so *altogether dissatisfied* that such Language can become the Mouth, or Pen of any one, that professeth *not only* Faith in Christ, *but also* that such his Faith is grounded upon the *inward* Manifestation and Revelation of Gods Spirit *in himself*, which you repeat with a [mark] we say *in himself*, as if you held, that to have ones Faith grounded upon the *Inward* Manifestation of Gods Spirit *in himself*, were *utterly inconsistent* with believing as the true Church believes. But for my part, I believe the true Church hath her Faith grounded upon *this inward* Manifestation and Revelation of Gods Spirit *in her self*. And if you grant that (which it behoves you to consider well before you deny) you cannot avoid the consequence, which is, That *every one who believes from, or hath his Faith grounded on, the inward Manifestation and Revelation of Gods Spirit in himself, doth, in so believing, believe as the Church believes*; because the true Church doth so believe, and hath her Faith so grounded in Christ her head, and the Author of her Faith. Had you stood in the Light, you would have seen this, and have understood also, that it is one thing to believe *as* the Church believes, and another thing to believe *because* the Church believes. The one hath the *same ground* for his Faith, that the Church hath for hers: The other makes the Churches Faith the ground of his Faith.

Now that the Reader may see how groundless your pretended dissatisfaction is, and that without cause you have sought an occasion to quarrel, I will set down what one of your selves (and he no mean one neither among you, but one that hath appeared as the Mouth for you all, *viz. William Rogers*) saith 3 Part, pag. 74. *I confess, the true Church is in the true Faith, and every member thereof is in some measure (at least) of the same Faith, that all the Elect of God are of; so that (says he) it may in Truth be said, every Member of the Church doth in some measure believe as the Church believes.* Very good, since then the Church is made up of Members, it may in Truth be said, according to your own Confession, that every Member of the Church doth in some measure believe as the Church believes. And since none whom you oppose, have at any time asserted, that the Faith of all the Members of the Church is or ought to be of one and the same degree, measure and proportion; what is there more

in what you have denyed, than there is in what you have confessed. If you are so dissatisfied with such Language, how came you to use such Language your selves? But it is evident, you pretended Dissatisfaction, that you might take an occasion to *defame the Innocent*. But the mischief you intended against others, is justly fallen upon your own heads: For by declaring your selves here dissatisfied with such Language, as you elsewhere confess may be said in Truth, you have sufficiently manifested that you your selves are departed from the Truth.

Your urging, that in the Church of Christ there are *Babes, Young Men, Fathers, Weak and Strong*, is nothing to the purpose: for there is nothing in those words out of which you have framed the Position, which seems in the least to imply, that there are not, or may not be, different measures or degrees of Faith in the true Church. For though it is absolutely necessary that every Member of the true Church be in the true Faith that is in God, yet is it not of absolute necessity that all the Members be in one and the same degree of Faith, but that they all be in some degree of the true Faith. And the Babe in Christ is as really in the true Faith that is in God, as the Young-men and Fathers are, though not so far in it. Nor is the Instance you give, from *Rom. 14.* of him that *eat Herbs*, of any force in this case; since, as your selves confess, it was in him *the fruit of weakness*, and the Apostle doth not call it the fruit of Faith. But in Part 3. page 74, 75. you say (or *William Rogers* for you) and that with Reflection upon that Friend whose words ye pretend to have taken your Position out of, *Should any arise to say, 'Tis folly and Hypocrisie to profess ones self a Member of the true Church, and not believe thus, as the true Church believes, without any further explanation of the words, or of what is intended thereby, such may subject themselves to censure.* But that Friend did explain his words, and shewed what Faith he intended thereby, when he said, *I affirm, the true Church is in the true Faith that is in God.* And therefore you, by your own Sentence, have subjected your selves to *just Sentence*, in not taking notice of this explanation, but abusing him as if there had been no explanation at all.

Having said what you could, or thought fit, against the Position, you leave it at length (in Part 1. page 26.) to the conscience of every impartial Reader, in the Light of Christ Jesus to weigh
and

and consider, whether it can be service to the Truth, and agreeable to the meaning of the Spirit at this day, for any person under the name of Quaker, to give forth this Doctrine, 'tis folly and Hypocrisie to confess our selves Members of the true Church; and yet not believe thus, as the true Church believes, though the Giver forth thereof may to this purpose also declare (as to give the Publisher thereof his due, he hath) That they never did preach up such a position as a great Argument to enforce people into their Faith. Since the Publisher of that Treatise did declare (as you confess) that Friends never did Preach up such a Position as a great Argument to enforce people into their Faith, you are (to give you also your due) the more disingenuous, unworthy and base to publish, insist upon and urge this (as you have done) against Friends, to defame them to the World as Favourers of Popery.

But this is not all ; *there's more due to you yet*, and 'twere pity but you should have it. You have publish'd a great Book to distinguish the Christian Quaker from the Apostate and Innovator. Your selves and your Party you account the Christian Quakers ; and all faithful Friends, that have born Testimony against that wicked Spirit which you are joyned to, you have branded for Apostates, Part 1. page 15. But now you have manifested your selves to be the Apostates, by joining with and abetting the Cause of those *old Apostates*, who, above seven years ago, writ against Truth and Friends from the *same Spirit*, to the *same end*, and much what after the *same manner*, as you have done now. For about the year 1673. some who had formerly made Profession of the Truth, and had been betrayed from the simplicity thereof, by the subtle workings of that Spirit which appeared in *John Perrot*, in the business of the *Hat*, ran out to that degree of Enmity against Truth and Friends as to publish several false and scandalous Pamphlets against them whereof one was called, *The Spirit of the Hat* ; Another, *Tyranny and Hypocrisie detested* ; a third, *Liberty of Conscience asserted against Imposition*. In all which, the design and endeavour of the Authors thereof appeared to be, to asperse and mis-represent Friends to the World (as you have now endeavoured to do) as *Apostates* and *Innovators*, as such who had declined from and forsaken their first Principles, and had espoused Popish Positions and Doctrines, as such who were setting up a *Romish Hierarchy*, and establishing an *Arbitrary Jurisdiction* over Conscience. This and

and much more of this kind did *those Apostates* then cast forth as a Flood against Friends. And this some of you (or of your Party) then saw, and joined with Friends in Testimony against, judging and accounting the Authors of those Pamphlets *Apostates* and Enemies to Truth. Yet their Vomit, which so many years ago, they cast up against Friends and Truth, have you since licked up, and are now vomiting out the same *afresh*. They cryed out for Liberty of Conscience, Liberty of Conscience, *just as you do*. They charg'd Friends with Impolition, *as you do*. They charg'd Friends with holding Romish Positions, *you in effect do the same*. They instanced in this, Of believing as the Church believes, *you pitch upon the same*. And indeed you trace those Apostates so, as if you had composed your *Book out of theirs*. And when a Friend in Truth, had, on behalf of Truth, written an Answer to one of those Apostate's Book (as other Friends did to others of them) *you now* take Occasion to fall in and side with the Apostate, to abet the Apostate's Cause, to re-inforce (what in you lies) the *Apostates Charge*, and endeavour (though in vain) to make void the Friend's defence. So that the *foot-steps* you have trod in, the Cause you have taken up, the Charge you have revived, the work you have undertaken, the way and method you have proceeded in, do all convict you of Apostacy, and evidence you to be *one*, in ground and root, with those Apostates whom you have so fully imitated, and that the spirit by which you are led, is the *very same* that appeared in *John Perrot*, and which led some of his followers into prejudice, Enmity and downright Opposition to Truth, even to write against Friends, as it hath done you, and that in the *same Track*.

Sett. 6. In pag. 29. you complain that some called Quakers, by writing under their hands have declared themselves to be the *Establishers of the Churches in the holy Order of Truth*. This you have up again, pag. 58. and again, pag. 75. speaking to the like effect, you say, *We have no ground from the Scriptures of Truth to expect, that any should be invested with power from on high to establish such things relating to the Conscience; much less to expect, that the Children of Light (under the New Covenant) should be led by the eternal spirit and word nigh in the heart, unto such a conformity*. But for all your confidence, you are decei-

ved: for it appears by the Scriptures of Truth, both that some have been *Instrumental* to *establish* the Churches, as *Acts* 16. 3. where the Apostles, Elders and Brethren were instrumental by their Decrees to *establish* the Churches, and *Timothy* was sent by *Paul* as an *Instrument* in Gods hand to *establish* the Church, at *Thessalonica*, 1 *Thess.* 3. 2. And also that the Children of light under the New Covenant were led by the eternal spirit and word in their hearts, into a Conformity to what was given forth by the same Spirit and word in the hearts of others. Of which Plenty of Instances may be given, as 1 *Cor.* 11. 2. *Acts.* 16. 4, 5. 2 *Cor.* 2. 15.

Seet. 7. In pag. 38. you declare your *seal*es to be for an *Independency*, which though you explain to be, *Not to depend on the Counsel of one man, nor of general, quarterly or monthly Meetings, but on the Grace of God.* Yet since you ground your Notion of *Independency* upon the words of another, who, you say, *Replying to your Wiltshire paper said, The end of this very spirit is downright Independencies, Parishes and Schisms,* it may well be gathered what manner of *Independency* you are for. Not an *Independency* upon Man or Men: for upon them and their Orders there must be a *Dependency*, as appears by your Paper for Separation signed by 87. of your Party, wherein they declare that their Men (so they call those of their Party that were of the monthly and quarterly Meetings) *have their authority given them by the Churches choice and consent.* So that their Men it seems are said to depend upon Men, or Meetings of Men, for their authority. This shews your pretence to an *Independency* upon Men, or Meetings, and to depend only upon the grace of God, is but a *gloss*, a *varnish*, which you would set upon your Cause. For none have more *absolute dependence* upon Men, than those amongst you who must depend upon you for their authority. And because others, whose dependence is indeed on the grace of God, would not submit to a dependence upon them, to be at their appointment, nor to meddle in the Affairs of the Church without authority first given them by them, your 87 Subscribers of that Paper for Separation grew angry, high and peremptory, and would neither meet any longer themselves, nor suffer their chosen appointed men, who depended on them for Authority, to meet any longer with those, that would not have their dependence upon them. In vain therefore do you labour to persuade

swade that you are against depending upon men, or Meetings of men, while a Paper subscribed by so many of your Party, and not disowned by your selves, contends so much for such a Dependence. And though you speak of a dependency on Gods Grace, yet the contrary appears: For the Grace of God being Universal, would lead you, if you depended thereon, into Oneness with those who are led thereby; whereas you are led in a crooked by-way, contrary to the Body ye pretend to be members of.

You speak of being left to the Grace of God, and the Teachings thereof, as manifest in everyones inward parts; and that the Antient Labourers, who commended you thereto, made no mention of having Dependencies on General, Quarterly, Monthly, or any other Meetings of men whatsoever; and therefore, you say, we cannot but give forth this as a warning to all, to take heed, that ye be not deceived by the cunning sleights and devices of men, to leave your Teacher, that cannot be removed into a Corner; and instead thereof be found depending on the Dictates, and Prescriptions of fallible men, pag. 42. This is it self a cunning sleight, and crafty device of Satan, in which he makes use of you as Instruments, to amuse, startle and shake the weak; and what in you lies to deceive the simple, by falsely insinuating that Friends would draw them from the Grace of God, and the Teachings thereof in themselves, to have a dependency on Meetings of men. Now as this is notoriously false in it self, so it is so much the greater wickedness in you to suggest such a falsehood, in as much as you knew it to be false. For but two pages before you set down the words of a Friend (whom you confess to be a public Breacher, pag. 36) an eminent person, no mean one, pag. 38a) commending for the Rule of Truth only, and saying, *They that would have a Meeting Rule, are as far from Truth, as they that would have a Man Rule: For it is neither man, nor many, but Truth it self that must, and will preside amongst us.* What could have been spoken more positive against depending on men, or Meetings of men; yet like men grown desperate, and resolved to do wrongs, but a few Lines after, in the same page, you say, *We take him to mean, that there are some who in his sense either are, or at the end may become, Schismatics, because they are not Principled to depend on the Assembly of men.* This you willfully pervert his meaning to a sense expressly contrary to his words.

Seit. 8. You say, page 42. If Report be true, it hath been jealousd by some, who cry much against some others, under the term of dark Spirits (though Honest Friends) That this kind of arguing, to leave Friends to the Grace, Light and Spirit of God, may lead into Rantism. It seems you are such as can take up a Report, and publish it to the Nation, with a Comment upon it, as if it were true, though you do not know whether it be true or no. Is not this a token of a dark Spirit? I am sure you never learn'd this of the Light, nor were led into it by the Spirit, or Grace of God. It is a sign you wanted Matter, or abounded with Envy, else you would not take up (or make) such Reports to imploy your selves in answering them. You say, The Lord rebuke that Spirit, that doth so much as jealous, that leaving people to the Light, may lead into Rantism: Such a suggestion, you say, is notoriously wicked. Yes, it is so indeed, and if you had not been notoriously wicked too, you would never have publish'd such a wicked suggestion, upon no better ground than the uncertain Report, of a jealousy, of you don't know who. But the Lord will rebuke that Spirit in you, and you together with it, for venting such notoriously wicked and malicious suggestions, as this is. If Report be true! But what if Report be not true? what have you done then? One would think, if Common Justice could not move you, yet Common Prudence might have led you, in point of Self-security, to have made sure of the Truth of your Report, before you had laid it for a foundation, to build so great and heavy a Charge upon. If Report be true, it hath been jealousd by some! By whom I pray? No body named. You shoot your Bolts at random. Only you give this Character of them, that they are such as cry much against some others, under the term of dark Spirits (though Honest Friends.) But by the Honesty of your dealing in this very Case, one may guess what will pass with you for Honest Friends.

To that which you call the Latter part of the Objection (grounded, as the former, upon an, If Report be true, &c.) viz. that 'Tis the Care of Backsliding Brethren, to appear as Watchmen over the flock, that so none, under pretence of being left to the Light, may run into Looseness, Lightness and Vanity, saying, The Light in my Conscience condemns me not. I Answer, that though none that keep to the pure Light, Spirit and Grace of God, can run into looseness, Lightness and Vanity, much less into Rantism.

Yet some, under *pretence* of being left to the Light, rejecting the care and watchfulness of Faithful Brethren, and growing into a distance and estrangedness from the Life and Unity of the Brethren in the Light, have run into that which has proved their hurt, their loss, their ruine; which, had they kept with the flock of the Companions, under the watchful Eye of the Faithful Brethren (for their good, and not for evil) they might probably have been preserved out of. But you seem here to allow, that it is the care of Faithful Brethren to appear as watchmen over the flock: For you say, *We say so too*; and you add, that those who approve themselves Watchmen, will endeavour to convince such, who in very deed run into looseness, &c. That though they may pretend the Light condemns them not, yet that their deeds are evil, and that the Light doth condemn the same, though they may be hardened, and see it not. I would to God you were not so hardened, but that you could see this to be your state! For in very deed what you have been doing is evil, and whatever you may pretend to the contrary, *The Light doth condemn the same*; though some of you, being hardened, may not see it, but in your hardness and blindness run against those, that by endeavouring to convince you of the evil of your undertaking, have approved themselves Faithful Watchmen. However, you will do well to remember hereafter, that by your own Confession, *They who see not what the Light condemns, it is because they are hardened; and that Faithful Brethren, as Watchmen over the flock, should endeavour to convince such.* But then you say, *Those who are true Watchmen, will as much as in them lies use their endeavours to bring the flock to the Light, to prove their deeds, whether they are wrought in God, and not to Papers, rather than to the Light.* This implies that some Watchmen amongst Friends endeavour to bring the flock to Papers, for proof of their Deeds; rather than to the Light; a suggestion notoriously false and wicked. Has ever any Friend endeavoured to bring the flock, or any of the flock, to Papers to prove their Deeds, whether they are wrought in God? O most abominable slander! The Faithful Brethren, whom God hath set as Watchmen over the flock, have endeavoured, and do, as much as in them lies, to bring the flock to the Light, to prove their Deeds. And this they have laboured to do both by word and writing; By word of Mouth, as opportunity has offered; and where by voice they could

not reach, there they have done it by Papers, or Epistles *given forth in the Light*: Thus did the Apostles also in their day, *whose Divine Epistles are hereby vilified*, as well as those of Friends, *and they themselves no less reflected on*. The Apostle Paul, as a true Watchman, Writ many Epistles to the flock of Christ, in several parts of the World; and though his eminent zeal for God had procured him the Envy of many false Brethren, the malice and obloquy of all Apostates, yet do I not find that any of them charged him as you by suggestion do Friends now, with endeavouring to bring the flock to Papers, instead of the Light. So that the course you now take, hath a *worse appearance* than any was taken by the *worst of Apostates* in that day.

Sett. 9. In your 7th, Section, pag. 44. you Treat of *Church-Government*. But because much of the 3 Part of your Book is spent upon that Subject, I chuse (for brevity, and to avoid Repetitions) to take more particular notice of it there: Yet not so wholly passing over it here, but to make some few Observations as I go. First then I observe, That seeming to startle at the word [*Church-Government*.] you say, pag. 45. *we ought to ask what is meant by it*. And in pag. 46. you take upon you to answer your own Question, and to give the meaning of the word [*Church-Government*.] and that in the sense of your Opposers too; and you say, *We take it to be thus, viz. That some who account themselves members of the Body of Christ, claim a Power to rule over other some, if not all the Rest, and to give forth sentences, Directions or Orders, which they ought to own, receive or obey though they may pretend they see it not their duty*. This you have laid as the Basis or foundation of your Opposition to *Church-Government*, and on this Bottom you have raised a Babel, which sufficiently discovers what manner of Builders you are. You have given this as the sense of your Opposers, and upon this sense you proceed for a dozen or fourteen pages together, and yet you say, *If this be the meaning of the word Church-Government, in the sense of our Opposers, &c.* It seems then you are not sure that this is the meaning of the word *Church-Government* in the sense of your Opposers, you are in the questioning, the doubting. But would any, but foolish Builders have ventured so bulky a fabric as yours, upon the sandy foundation of an IF? (for though you pretend you have cause to believe it, not only from R. B's Book of Government, but also from what hath been said

or propagated by others: Yet since it is certain you could have no cause from *R. B's Book* so to believe, there is the less reason to believe you in what you say others have said or propagated.) Now that this is *not* the sense of your Opposers, I as one of your opposers, do affirm, and do charge it on you as a false and slanderous Suggestion. There is no *such* Government among us, nor owned by us. No member of the body among us claims any *such* Power to Rule over others. Nor doth any Member among us claim any *such* Power to give forth Sentences, Directions or Orders, which the rest ought to own, receive or obey, though they may pretend they see it not their duty. But *all* Power and Rule in, over and amongst us, is ascribed to *Christ Jesus*, upon whom the Government is; who may give forth what Sentences, Directions and Orders he pleases, and through whom he pleases. And as they in whom he moves at any time to give forth any Sentence, Direction or Order, ought in Faithfulness to give forth the same; so they for whose sakes it is given forth, if they dwell in and are watchful to the Light, will see and own it to be their duty to receive, and obey what is so given forth by *Christ Jesus*, through any Member of the Body. The meaning therefore which you would fasten upon your Opposers, is your own meaning, not theirs. Besides; if you dare believe your selves, you have before rendred it impossible that this should be the meaning of your Opposers: For you say in *pag. 13. None that are to be Ruled, are excluded from being Rulers*; how then can some claim such a Power as you speak of, to Rule over other some, if not all the rest? This manifests both your *Err*, and (the effect thereof) *Confusion*, in assigning such inconsistent and contradictory meanings. But what you deliver as the sense of your Opposers, (*viz. That some who account themselves Members of the Body of Christ, claim a Power to Rule over other some, if not all the rest*) looks more like your own sense, as it is express in the Paper for Separation subscribed by *John Stany, John Wilkinson, and 85. more.* Wherein those Separate Subscribers speak of giving Authority to some, of appointing some, whom they call *Their Men*; and on the other hand complain of others for Acting without Authority from them, to whom (say they) *we gave no power*, and charge them with having *Usurped Authority*, because they had not Authority.

ty from them. Consider now whether this looks not like *some claiming a Power to Rule over other some, if not all the rest;* when *some take upon them to appoint some, and give Authority to some to Act in the Affairs and concerns of the Church, calling such their men;* and exclude others from acting or meddling, because they have not Power from them, and if any such do meddle or act in the Churches Affairs, whom they have not given Power to, cry out upon them as *Usurpers of Authority,* and what not.

Sett. 10. In pag. 47. upon the words of Christ, *Mat. 18. 15, 16, 17, 18. If thy Brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault, between thee and him alone: If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy Brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three Witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church: But if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen man, and a Publican. Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven. And the Words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 6. 1. Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to Law before the Unjust, and not before the Just, &c. You say, We reasonably conclude, that the words of Christ, and of the Apostle only hinted at, either personal Offences; or differences touching worldly matters; and that therein the duty of the Church was only to exhort to submit to their Council; which if they did not, they might justly be esteemed as Heathen men. Ay! did the words of Christ (say you) hint only at either personal Offences, or differences touching worldly matters? Then belike you don't reckon Christ's words related to both these, but only to either one or to other of them, and you don't know to which. But why I pray, might not Christ's words relate to both these, as well as only to either one or to other of them? Nay why must Christ's words hint only at either personal Offences, or differences touching worldly matters, and not at other differences also? Were other differences that might happen in the Church, to be left uncomposed, and a Remedy provided for these, or one of these only? In 3 Part pag. 36. William Rogers confutes William Rogers and all you together: For there he says, Every case wherein one Brother may trespass against another, may*

may according to right reason be comprehended in it. He extends it there to every Case wherein one Brother may trespass against another; you and he together restrain it here *only to either personal Offences, or differences touching worldly Matters*. Sure either his Reason was not right, though he says it was, or your Conclusion was not reasonable, though you conclude it was. But let it pass for a *contradiction*, of which you have store. You say, in case of personal Offences, or differences touching worldly matters, *The duty of the Church was Only to exhort to submit to their Council. Only to exhort!* Is that all? Hath the Church *nothing* further to do in such Cases? Methinks the Church should have *something more* to do, than *Only* to exhort. And if I mistake not, you find somewhat more for her to do by and by; for notwithstanding you say, *The duty of the Church was Only to exhort to submit to their Council*; yet you add, *That if they who were so exhorted did not submit, they might justly be esteemed as Heathen men*. And was it not then the duty of the Church to declare them such? Yes sure, and that by a solemn Judgment too, as the following words in the Text imply [*Verily I say unto you, what so ever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven, Mat. 18. 18.*] Then that was somewhat *more* than *Only* exhorting. And in pag. 52. where you speak again of this matter, and of the Church's Power, you say, *If the Parties differing refuse to choose Honest men to end the difference, the Church of Christ hath Only Power to admonish them to their duty*. And yet, in contradiction to your selves, you there also add; *That if such as the Church shall so admonish, Refuse to take the Churches wholesome Council, the Church may then declare such unworthy of their Society*; Which is the same thing as to declare them Heathen men, or to Excommunicate them. So that this is somewhat more than *Only* to admonish them to their duty: For here's a *not Only*, but *Also*; not *Only* admonish them to their duty, but *Also* if they refuse to take their wholesome Council, may then declare such unworthy of their Society. You forgot your selves therefore, when you so positively affirmed, that the Church of Christ hath *Only* Power to admonish, since by your own Confession she hath *Also* power (for may, is potential, William) to declare such, as refuse to take her wholesome Council, *unworthy* of her Society. However, it appears from your own Concessions, that the Church hath Power to exhort and admonish such

Offenders,

Offenders, as are brought before her, to *submit* to her Council, and that *under the penalty* of being justly esteemed Heathen men, and declared unworthy of her Society, if they refuse to *submit*.

Yet you seem displeased with some *who have* (you say) *approved a Plea for such a Church-Government, as claimes a power of deciding matters relating to Conscience, and outward things also, on the occasion of differences raised touching worldly Estate: and that others ought to obey such decisions, which* (say you) *in its natural Consequence hath* (as we take it) *no less Tendency, than to claim power over our Properties, as well as Consciences. Can you distinguish between Worldly matters, outward things, Worldly Estate and Properties?* (for all these terms you have here used *within the compass of a dozen lines, or less*) for my part I took them all for Synonyma's, and must do yet till you instruct me otherwise. Now if all these several terms are of one and the same signification, and import the same thing, then according to your *reasonable Conclusion* (as you call it) that the words of Christ, *Mat. 18. 15, &c.* hinted at differences touching *worldly matters*, it may be as reasonably concluded that the words of Christ hinted at differences touching *Outward things*, touching *Worldly estate*, touching *Property*; and that it was the duty of the Church to exhort such as differed touching *outward things, worldly estate or Properties*, to *submit* to her Council or Judgment, which if they did not, they might *justly* be esteemed Heathen men, she had power to declare them unworthy of her Society. Now I cannot but wonder you should thus strangely *thwart* your own exposition of Christ's words concerning the power of the Church, that when you had but newly concluded (and that, as you say, reasonably too) that those words of Christ hinted at differences, touching *worldly matters* (which were to be brought to the Church for decision, as the last Remedy, when all other means had proved ineffectual) you should forthwith, in the self same Period, go about to deny, that the Church hath power to decide differences, arising between any of its own Members, touching *outward things, worldly Estate or Property*. Yet this you harp at often; and in pag. 51. you say, *'Tis not likely that Christ's members should by his authority, claim a jurisdiction in the matters relating to this world;* though but two leaves before you had concluded that what Christ, spake *Mat. 18.* concerning the power

power and authority of the Church, *related to differences touching worldly matters.* But your great offence lies against R. B. for saying, " This order reacheth the taking up and composing of differences, as to *outward things*; And, we do boldly averr, " as a people gathered together by the Lord unto the same faith, " and distinguished from all others by our joynt Testimony and " sufferings, that we have power and authority to decide and remove these things. This you cry out against with open mouth; This, you say, *we testify is repugnant to the Light of Christ Jesus within us, and Testimony of the Scriptures of truth without us.* The Scripture you offer shall be considered by and by; but for your testifying that this is repugnant to the light of Christ Jesus within you, since it is not repugnant to, but agreeable with, the light of Christ Jesus in his body the Church, you had best take heed that ye *put not darkness in your selves for light* (for if the light in you be darkness, *how great is that darkness*, Mat. 6. 23.) But to the thing. If the taking up and composing of differences, as to outward things, be *beyond the reach* of the Church's power, to what end (think you) did Christ command that differences touching *outward things*, or *worldly matters*, should be brought before the Church, when they could not be ended otherwise? To what purpose did he affix such a Seal to the authority of the Church [*what soever ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven*] and that (as your selves explain it) with relation to differences touching *worldly matters*, if the Churches authority did not reach to the taking up and composing of such differences?

Sett. 11. But you are loth to believe that the *Assent of parties* was intended by the Approvers of R. B's book; and your first Reason pag. 52. is, for that *there is not* (as you say) *in any part of the said Book one Tittle to that purpose.* Have all you that are concerned in this Treatise read *every Tittle* in that Book? Or do you take this upon Trust? Questionless had you read it, and with a good mind, you might have found *more than a Tittle* to that purpose. For first in the place you have cited, pag. 39. The assent of Parties is *not excluded*, but rather *included*: for when he says " We do boldly averr, as a People gathered together by the Lord unto the same faith, and distinguished from " all others by our joynt Testimony and sufferings, that we have " power and authority to decide and remove these things

amongst our selves, without going to others to seek redress, he plainly includes the whole Church (of which the Parties, differing are a part, till by refusing to submit to the Churches Counsel, they have cut themselves off) which he expresses by those words [*our selves*] in opposition to the World, whom he distinguishes from the Church, by the word [*others.*] Secondly, in pag. 41. He says, " Now suppose any should be so pettish or humorous, as not to agree in such matters to the judgment of his Brethren, &c. which shews the agreement of the Parties was intended and aimed at, Yet again, in the same pag. he says, " Indeed if there be any such, have been or appear to be of us, as suppose there is not a wise man among us all, " nor an honest Man that is able to judge betwixt his Brethren, " we shall not covet to meddle in their matter, &c. This plainly implies an *Assent of Parties*: for it is as if he had said, If any that appear to be of us, have so mean an Opinion of us, as to think they cannot find a Man among us all, that is wise enough, and honest enough for *them to commit their Cause to*, but they will chuse to refer their Cause to the People of the world. We shall not covet to meddle with their Cause, being perswaded that either they or their Cause is nought. Had you read these passages with a fair mind, you would not have so rashly asserted, that *Assent of Parties was not intended* by the Approvers of R. B's book. But you offer another Reason, thus, *Neither could such Assent be so express and yet the case whereunto it related be pertinent to the matter of power treated on in that Section* (which was, in what Cases, and how far this Government extends) *when as any Heathen man* (you say) *might claim the like power, when given by assent of parties.* But by your leave, you are out in that also: for though an Heathen man may claim a power, when given him by assent of Parties, yet can no Heathen claim the like power or such a power as the true Church is invested with. For the true Believers, or Church of Christ have a power derived from Christ, antecedent to any power the parties can give by their assent; by which Church-power they can require the Parties to assent, and can exclude them the Society of the Church, which is the body, and consequently of Christ the Head, if contemning the power given by the head to the Body, they refuse to submit to the Counsel of the body. Has the Heathen man any power like this? Or is there any thing from hence to

countenance your charge that the Approvers of R. B's Book did *not intend assent of Parties*? How unworthy then, and unjust are you, to suggest as if R. B. had said, *We have power to decide and remove these things without the assent of the parties differing*, when as first there is no such word in his Book, and secondly R. B. Himself as your Book relates, (3. part, pag. 125.) hath declared, *It was far from his intention!*

Now to the Scripture you brought (and which in 3 Part pag. 39. is repeated to prove that R. B's saying, "As a people gathered together by the Lord unto the same Faith, &c. We have power and authority to decide and remove differences among our selves, is repugnant to the Testimony of the Scriptures of Truth. It is Luke 12. 13, 14. Upon which you say, *If Christ himself, when he was desired by a certain man to bid his Brother divide the Inheritance with him, refused to be a Judge in that matter, relating to property, when desired by one Party, saying, Who made me a Judge over you? How much more unreasonable is it, for his Members to assume a Jurisdiction, when desired by neither Party, &c. I answer, You argue fallaciously. He that desired this of Christ, was not one of Christ's Kingdom, but of the Kingdom of the world; not one that profest Subjection to his Government, but to the Government of the World; not one of his Disciples, not a Member of his Church, but one of the Multitude, as appears by comparing the 13th. verse with the first. He might well then say unto such, Who made me a Judge, or a Divider over you?* But can any one think he would have given the same Answer, if a difference had hapned in *his own Family*, among his Disciples? No sure, to them he said, *Ye call me Master and Lord; and ye say well: For so I am, Joh. 13. 13.* Your instance therefore is very improper and from the purpose, since that is of persons of the World, *out of the Church*, and therefore can bear no proportion with this Case, which lies wholly within the Church.

Sett. 12. In pag. 55. and elsewhere frequently, *You cry out against Imposition*, without Cause, since you can give no Instance of any Imposition, unless you will fetch it from your Paper for Separation, Subscribed by John Story, John Wilkenfon and 85. more, wherein they would impose upon all Friends to cease acting or meddling in the Affairs of the Church, but those whom

whom they give Authority to. But the very word [*Imposition*] you think will make a great noise, and serve to startle the weak and undiscerning. After the same manner too, and to the same end, you often declaim against *Blind obedience*, offering the *blind for a Sacrifice*, acting without sight, without clearness, without Conviction, &c. By all which you would insinuate, that such obedience, such acting, such submission is required and pressed by Friends. But your Insinuations are *false and slanderous*, and you shall never be able to prove a tittle of them. All your Essays that way hitherto, have but served to discover your own Confusion. In pag. 54. from an ill made Objection, of your own contriving against Friends, in the Name of Friends, you speak of Offering the Blind for a Sacrifice, and not seeing it to be their duty, and the like: And here in pag. 55. you deliver a piece of your Faith, which you say is, *That all those who are Heirs of the Kingdom which is everlasting, are Entitled to a like freedom not to be imposed upon each by other, contrary to the Divine sense and Heavenly understanding, which as co-heirs and co-workers together they are made partakers of.* But alas, how are they co-workers with others, who see not the work those others are exercised in? How are they made partakers of the Divine sense and Heavenly understanding, who do not see that to be their duty, which is the requiring of the Spirit of God?

In pag. 57. As a conclusion to your Objection, you say, you have this further to add; *That you do know many of your Opposers, or at least such, who are not at unity with you, have very confidently made use of such discourse as is contained in the last recited Objection, to induce you to follow outward Prescriptions and Orders, though not convinced of its service.* And in the same page you speak of *exalting Self, Form, Observation, Prescription, Order, &c.* Yet so inconsistent you are, that in pag. 55. you say, *In all the last mentioned Objection, there is no Plea for Obedience unto, or following any thing but the Spirit in its appearance, whether through the Brethren, or thy self.* And for your apprehending that any of your Opposers would draw you to follow outward Prescriptions and Orders, though not convinced of their service; it is (to speak the most favourably) a great mistake. You have been often told the contrary by many of your Opposers. Nay R. B. whom you are such great Opposers of, hath long since, in his Book of Government (as you call it) told you in so many

many Syllables, pag. 86. I say not, *any ought to do it before they be clear*. Yet it is not unlikely that some may have endeavoured to dissuade you from that *mad, raging, violent Opposition*, which I have seen some of your Party make against such things as you say you don't see, you have not a clear sight of, you are not satisfied concerning. Had your Party been as watchful against *blind Opposition*, as you pretend to be zealous against *blind Obedience*; I dare boldly say, upon good assurance, it had been better with you than it now is.

Again, in pag. 55. you say, *However we must confess, he that is not diligent to wait upon God in the exercise of his own measure of Grace received, is by the Light of Christ condemnable*: Not (you say) for refusing to perform that which he sees not to be his duty, &c. But for his neglecting to wait upon God. How sound you are in this latter part of your Sentence, I will not here spend time to discuss, supposing I may have occasion to Treat of it in another place. But on the former part of the Sentence, containing your Confession, I observe, that when the Light of Christ hath condemned some such negligent ones, for not waiting as they ought upon God, they strait-way fly upon the Instruments, through which the Light hath condemned them, and cry out, *Imposition, Usurpation, Persecution; Judge not, meddle not with us; Taxing them with assuming a Jurisdiction over Conscience*, and charging them with *usurping Authority*, as your 87 Subscribers of the Paper for Separation, do some Friends on the like occasion.

Sett. 13. In pag. 58. Amongst other Questions which you say have been frequently ask'd, by such with whom you cannot be at unity in all things; you set this for one, viz. *Are you for settled Monthly and Quarterly Meetings touching outward business, since those who would have Meetings as occasion offers, are accounted Designers to throw down all Meetings for outward business, relating to the Affairs of Truth?* And these, or such like Questions have been ask'd of Friends (you say) in Truth, *That could not Answer thereto Tea*. This is repeated in 4 Part pag. 21. 'Tis to be hoped Friends in Truth will read your Design in your Answer. You could not Answer *Tea* to settled Monthly and Quarterly Meetings: No, 'tis like so. You are for *unsettling* all as fast as you can; for having Meetings *as occasion offers*. And who,

who but your selves must be Judges of the occasion! And when you see occasion you may appoint a Meeting, and appoint your chosen men, to whom you have given Authority, to manage the business of such Meetings, and require all others, whom you have not given Power to, to forbear acting, to *cease meddling* in the Affairs of the Church, and if any such do act or meddle, charge them with *Usurping Authority*, as the 87 Subscribers of the Paper for Separation have done by Friends in the North. You touch'd upon this string once before, *pag. 38.* where you say, *But yet we are not against appointed Meetings for the outward Services of Truth, for that hath been and is our practice, knowing that there may be a Service therein, AS OCCASION OFFERS.* You are not it seems against appointed Meetings, so they may be of *your own appointing*, not Monthly and Quarterly, but in *another Method*, *pag. 58.* not settled, but (when you see occasion) *as occasion offers*, *pag. 38.* Might Meetings be thus at your appointment, you would not be against Meetings: But settled Monthly and Quarterly ~~and~~ Meetings you cannot say *Tea* to. And this appears to be not only your Principle, but, where you obtain your Practice also. For appointed Meetings, you say, hath been and is your practice; but then it must be *as occasion offers*, and in *another method*. And such unsettled, occasional Meetings appointed in another method than Monthly and Quarterly, you have of late had experience of (if I rightly apprehend you) in the Counties of *Westmoreland* and *Wilts*, *pag. 58.* God grant your experience (in that matter) never extend further; and that you may come to a right sense of the *mischief you have done* in those (and some other) Counties, and may have a true sight and understanding (as, blessed be God, many have) of the design of that Spirit, by which you *Innovators* are led into your *new Methods*, which undoubtedly is to *unsettle* first, and then by degrees *throw down* (if it could) all Meetings for outward business, relating to the Affairs of Truth.

Self. 14. In *pag. 60.* You take occasion from *Mat. 23.* to say, *Here is no ground to believe that Christ intended, that when he was departed, his Disciples should be exalting themselves one over another, as Governours. True, self exaltation is condemned by Christ, Whosoever shall exalt himself, shall be abased, saith Christ.* But then he adds, *And he that shall humble himself,*
shall

shall be exalted. And we find afterwards, that though he de-
based such self-exalting spirits as Diotrephes, and others; yet
he forbore not for all that to make some Overseers of the Flock,
Acts. 20. 28. and appointed some to rule in his power and
life over others, 1 Tim. 5. 17. Heb. 13. 7, 17, 24. And it
 had been injustice in any, to have charged those with exalting
 themselves whom he so exalted.

Again you say, *had it been so that Christ intended the exalta-
 tion of one of his Disciples as an Head or Supream (unto whom the
 rest ought to have had an eye, in a more peculiar manner than or-
 dinary) he would have undoubtedly signified so much.* Had you
 urged, this where such an Headship and Supremacy is claimed,
 you had done something; but now nothing, but shewed your
 Teeth. We own *no such Headship, no such Supremacy, no
 such Exaltation of one Disciple over the Rest.* But we confess to
 the life of Christ Jesus as Head and Supream *in and over all the*
Members of his Body; unto which all his Disciples ought to have
an Eye, and bow to the appearance thereof in and through which
soever of them it appears. But what mean all these *lurking Sug-*
gestions? If you have any thing of this nature to charge upon
 any among us, come forth *like men,* and don't thus lye *snarling*
at the heel. You have many more passages in this page of the
 same cast, tending to beget *evil surmises* and jealousies in the
 minds of the weak; but your spirit is favoured, and its work
 seen, and its path discovered, and the end of it (blessed be God)
 fore-seen by many.

In pag. 61. You say, *such as are married unto Christ and
 in fellowship each with other in the spirit, ought to demean them-
 selves each towards other, full of love, charity, bowels of compassion,
 long suffering, forbearance, Meekness, humility, patience, gentleness,*
and all other vertues, that are the fruit of the Spirit of God; but as
to obedience every one owes that unto Christ: No doubt he does. But
 does he not owe love too unto Christ, as well as obedience?
 Well then, as his owing love to his brother, does not excuse
 him from owing love unto Christ also, so his owing obedience to
 Christ does not excuse him from owing obedience to his brother
 also in Christ. Doth not Paul bid the Ephesians, *Submit them-*
selves one to another in the fear of God, Eph. 5. 21; and is
 not that obedience? Nay does not the Author to the Hebrews
 exhort them expressly thus, *Obey them that have the rule over?*

you, and submit your selves, Heb. 13. 17. Nay further, Did not you your selves say in this very Treatise, pag. 15. We look upon our selves all servants one unto another: And doth not Service imply obedience? I am sure, by the Apostles argument, Rom. 6. 16. Obedience implies service: and the Terms are very convertible.

Señt. 15. You now undertake in pag. 61. to manifest the Original ground and rise of the difference between you and others, which you make to have risen from a different sense touching G. F. the General Meeting, or Womens Meetings. On the whole matter, say you, the great variance amongst some, once at Unity, we have cause to know hath risen from a different sense touching one, some, or all of these three particulars. It seems then you dont know whether it hath risen from all these three or but some of them; and if from some of them, you are as much still to seek from which. You are in the uncertainties, roving and floating about. Fain you would fasten the Rise of the difference upon some person or thing that you have a Peek at. And upon this Subject you run Divisions at a strange rate. In the 23 pag. of the Preface, William Rogers tells us, It is clearly manifested unto him, and (as he hath understood) many others, that that one person George Fox hath been the very chief Instrument (or at least, an Abettor of such as have) whereby a biting, devouring Spirit, is entred in amongst the flock. Yet notwithstanding this clear manifestation to him in the Preface, when he and you (like Malevolent Planets come in Conjunction in the Book, you know not whether it hath originally risen from a different sense touching G. F. or touching the General Meeting, or touching Womens Meetings, or whether touching one, some, or all of them; so much you are to seek, notwithstanding W. R.'s pretended clear manifestation. Nay W. R. himself in his Preface too, pag. 9. tells us, One great part of the Controversy is touching John Story: Where was his clear Manifestation then? How know you then but it might arise from a different sense touching John Story? But he has another reserve yet in pag. 39. of the Preface, he tells us, The imposing or pressing the Observation of other mens lines upon any, is one great occasion of the Religious differences treated on. So that he in his Preface hath assigned three distinct grounds or occasions of the differences, and he and you together in the Book have

have assigned three also (two whereof are fresh ones, that he did not mention in his Preface) and yet you are to seek which of these to fix on. And I doubt not but in its proper place, I may remember you of *one more*, which I have observed in another part of your Book. But this may suffice at present to shew your Confusion.

In the same pag. You charge G. F. that he hath taken upon him to give forth Directions and Instructions to others. This is a rash uncharitable Judgment, and it looks the worse from you, because you so often cry out *against judging*. It was within less than a Leaf, that you were up with [judge not, that you be not judged] and are you got into the Judgment-Seat already! How dare you say G. F. hath taken upon him to give forth Direction and Instructions to others, when there are so many living Witnesses, that what hath been given forth through him, for Direction or Instruction to the Church, hath proceeded from the Spirit of God? And surely that God should speak to his Church through any Member of it, is *no new thing*, nor need seem strange to any that will consider, that the Apostle Paul had it *laid upon him*, and that by God, to give forth Directions and Instructions to the Churches, who were under the *New Covenant*, as well as we. Might not the ill-affected and *Apostates* in that day have taxed Paul, that he took upon him to give forth Directions and Instructions to others, as you do G. F. But, you will say, they had done evil in so doing; and so, say I, have you.

Self. 16. Here again you repeat your slander, of G. F.'s being look'd upon by Friends as *Moses*, you say, *Many there are amongst us, who affirm, that they have more than Ordinary cause to believe, that many professing the Truth do look upon G. F. with whom the Lord in these latter days hath raised up, and set in the place among the Children of Light, a Moses not amongst the Children of Israel*. I cannot but take notice here, how industrious you are; what pains you take; how many rubbings and windings you make to wrigle in a slander. *Many, you say, are amongst you who affirm*. So then you don't ground your Charge upon your *own* knowledge; but upon what *others* affirm. Neither is their affirmation grounded upon *their own* best-wisdom, for they do not affirm that they know, but that they have *more than ordinary cause to believe*, &c. What *wisdom* is this?

here? Is this like men? For one man to ground an Accusation against another upon a third mans affirming he hath more than ordinary Cause to believe it. Such as are more than Ordinary full of Envy, will easily find more than Ordinary Cause to believe any evil, they have a mind to believe, against one they do more than Ordinarily hate. But since many amongst you (as appears by your Book) abound with false Jealousies and evil Surmises; the considerate Reader will find the greater cause to believe your ill grounded suggestions spring from thence. However, I desire you'll remember, that what here you insinuate upon the credit of others, you have charged downright in a formal Position, pag. 9, 10. And that in my observation thereon, I have put you upon the proof of it, and left it mean while at your door, as a slander.

Sett. 17. Another slander you vent in pag. 66. where you charge some with concluding they are entred into the Possession of the Power of God, because they take upon them to be Members of a *Womans Meeting*, distinct from the men. This is a false Charge, proceeding from a scornful, envious mind, to say no more of it. Yet upon this Charge you proceed thus; *Those*, say you, *who on that foot so conclude, we cannot but take to be ignorant of the Power of God; notwithstanding they may quote G. F. for proof of such their reason, who writing to Thomas Goldney, signified (you say) That he was moved to set up Womens Meetings, that all might be in the possession of the Power of the Lord.* Were you not Ignorant of the Power of God, were you not void of the Justice of Truth, were you not destitute of the Love of God and of true Christian Charity? you would never have dared to vent so unlikely a slander, as that any do conclude they are entred into the Possession of the Power of God, because they take upon them to be Members of a *Womans Meeting*, distinct from the men. And had you not also been guilty of too much Ignorance, you would not have carped at those words, which you say G. F. Writ to T. G. Since it is obvious that many things may be *Instrumental* to bring to the Possession, in which notwithstanding the Possession doth not stand. You will not say, I suppose, that the Possession of the Power of God stands in hearing Truth Preached; nor will you; I hope, deny that the hearing of Truth Preached may be *Instrumental* to bring to the Possession

sion of the Power of God. Why then may not Womens Meetings be *Instrumental* to bring to the Possession of the same Power? And if they may, why then might not G. F. (without your *Scoffing Censure*) Write, That he was moved to set up Womens Meetings, that all might be in the Possession of the Power of God?

Sett. 18. In pag. 68. You begin your 9th. Section with an *Epistle*, evidencing (you say) the qualifications of such whom Satan makes use of, to rend and divide the Church of Christ. And this you tell us three times over, in pag. 67, 68. that we may be sure to take notice of it. The Qualifications of these Satanical Instruments, you set down in pag. 69. thus; *The Persons in whom he, [Satan] hath chiefly appear'd to accomplish the same [Division, &c.] have been such as usually appear more publick than other their Brethren, and that under various qualifications: some have had Zeal without knowledge, and some have had knowledge without Zeal, and others have abounded in confidence without either knowledge or Zeal.* Then you add in pag. 70. thus; *Now forasmuch as in this Treatise variety of matters is discours'd, wherein divers persons have been concerned (many of whom were once at Unity, which we are perswaded consisted in the everlasting Truth) and that every one of them might reasonably have been taken to be under one of the aforesaid qualifications, &c.* Upon this I observe thus, That if (as you say) Every one of those divers persons, who have been concerned in the variety of matters discours'd of in your Treatise, might reasonably have been taken to be under one of the aforesaid Qualifications; then since John Story, John Wilkinson, William Rogers, and many more of you have been concerned therein, it plainly follows from your own premises, that John Story, John Wilkinson, William Rogers, and as many more of you, as have been to concerned, may reasonably be taken to be under one of the aforesaid Qualifications, viz. *Of having Zeal without knowledge, or knowledge without Zeal, or abounding with Confidence without either knowledge or Zeal.* So that you have unwarily (though not undeservedly) brought your selves under the Qualifications of such, whom Satan makes use of to Rend, and divide the Church of Christ. And besides, The other Character you give of them, viz. *That the Persons in whom Satan hath chiefly appear'd to accomplish the same, have been such as usually appear more publick than other their Brethren*, fits you exceeding well: for none of your Bre-

Brethren have appeared so publick in the Service of Satan, to rend and divide the Church, as you who have published your Book to that end.

But you descend to speak more particularly of those three Qualifications, and first of those who have Zeal without knowledg. *Glarity*, you say, obligeth us not to conclude, that they design any thing more than to live well, that so they may die well, or any thing less, than to appear what they know they are. Hereupon I observe, 1. That if, according to what Charity obliges you to conclude, This sort doth not design any thing more than to live well, that so they may die well, then by the same Charity you are obliged to conclude, that these do not design to impose upon others, to Lord it over others, to usurp an authority over the Consciences or Properties of others, or to exercise any of those Irregularities, which you have so uncharitably charged upon your Opposers. So that if you intend to rank any of your Opposers under this qualification, one of these two will unavoidably follow, that you must either renounce this Conclusion, which you confess Charity hath obliged you to make, viz. that these design nothing more than to live well, that so they may die well; or else retract those unjust Charges, which for want of Charity, you have loaded your Opposers with, since whoever is guilty of but the Twentieth part of what you suggest against Friends, must needs design something more than only to live well, that so they may die well. 2. If these, who you say have zeal without knowledge, design nothing less than to appear what they know they are, then they must know what they are, and consequently cannot properly be said to be without knowledge, as you (not through Charity nor knowledge, but through want of both) say they are.

Self. 10. In pag. 72. You fall to your old Trade of *standing upon Report*. Your words are these, Moreover, 'tis observable, that (if Report be true) this Doctrine hath of late been exalted, to *Unity* but in conformity; which if applied to the outward Prescriptions of one man or Assemblies of men, assuming to themselves authority to sit and determine in matters appertaining to the Gospel, &c. Here's II upon II. If Report be true, this Doctrine hath of late been exalted, &c. And then again, Which if applied to outward Prescriptions, &c. But what if Report be not true?

or being true, *be not so applied as you have here applied it?* Are not you then *false Accusers*, and most *abominable Calumniators*? For my part, I do believe the Report to be (at least) *false*, if not *forged*; and your application extremely *malicious*. And are you grown so *past shame*, as not to blush at such wicked dealing. At this *Ungodly Rate of writing*, when men shall dare to vent their *scandals*, with an *IF*, and belch their *slanders* out upon Report, I might well ask (in the words of one of your selves, Preface pag. 10.) *what defence can there be against a slanderous tongue?* But besides the foul injustice of such dealing, what more horrible hypocrisy could you have shewed, than when you or some of you have so frequently let fly your *slanders* with an [*If Report be true, As report speaks, as is credibly Reported, &c.*] of which manifold Instances may be seen in 1. Part, pag. 36, 42, 72. in 4th. Part, pag. 85, 94. in 5. Part, pag. 12, 17, 27, 31, 49, 52, 61, 66. and Postscript pag. 27. to wipe your mouths very demurely, and say, as some of you do, 2. Part pag. 89. *We are not willing to accuse on Report*, And as William Rogers does, 4 Part pag. 83. I ever was of this mind, to give little Credit to report, that tended to the scandal of a Brother. What greater deceit than this!

Sett. 20. Having finish'd your Epistle, you annex a Paper, which you say was given forth by Edward Burroughs. But let me tell you, Your Paper is of *suspected Credit*, and you must give better Evidence of its being his, than your own bare words, before it will be acknowledged to be his. There are some passages in that paper, which very much deprectiate it, as in page 79. Where speaking Parabolically of Christ and his Ministers under the Metaphor of a *Shepherd* and his *Dogs*, it is said, *He had many pretty little Dogs, which did eat of his own Morfels, and did lye at his Feet; for he loved them ve ywell, and took great delight in them; and that he sent these Dogs and did make them gather his flock, &c.* Yet in pag. 81. it is said, *Some of the Dogs were very foolish, and did not understand his mind: Nay they were ready to devour the Lambs, for there was something of the nature of the Woolf in them.* Now is not this a likely matter (or rather very unlikely) that Christ the good Shepherd, should send forth such Ministers to gather his flock, as were *foolish* and *did not understand his mind*? But how much more unlikely is it then

then, that this good Shepherd (who could not be deceived) should not only feed these Dogs with *his own* Morfels, and let them lye at his feet, but also *love them very well*, and take great delight in them, and which is more, send those very Dogs to gather in his flock, which he knew had something of the nature of the *Wolf* in them! Would any Shepherd outwardly amongst men make choice of a *Wolf* to keep his *Sheep*? Surely nay. Who then can believe that Christ would send such *Wolfish*-natured Ministers to gather his sheep and tender lambs into the Fold. Another passage I observe in pag. 82. in these words, *Friends I am constrained by the Spirit of endless love to warn you all, That you may forbear judging of any man anymore, upon any pretence what-soever, &c.* This is too general, to be sound; and too unsound to be Edward Burroughs's. And if you your selves do really believe this Paper was given forth by E. B. as over and over you say it was, and that too expressly by the Spirit of the Lord, I would gladly know how you can reconcile your practice of judging with this Paper, since this paper as you here see doth positively warn all to forbear judging any man any more upon any pretence what-soever; and yet nothing is more frequent with you throughout your Book than upon some pretences or other (and pretences only) to judge Friends, some by Name (as G. F. R. B. I. B. C. M. &c.) others by marks, descriptions, and characters, some particularly, and by themselves; others in general and (as it were) by the lump. But whoever was the Author of that paper, it seems to relate to the *world's people*, the ungathered, rather than to Friends, whom the Lord God, in tender love, by the arm of his power, Blessed be his great Name, hath gathered into the Fold of Rest. For in the beginning of it it is said, *The Author was grieved in his spirit for the Scattered of Israel.* And a little further 'tis said, *He saw a great Field or Common, where many Beasts were feeding, amongst which were a great flock of Sheep feeding also.* The sheep here spoken of were so far from being gathered into the green pastures (as Blessed be the Lord his chosen People are) that they were feeding amongst other Beasts in Common. Then after this 'tis said the shepherd came, and sent his Dogs to gather them into a Fold. They were such it seems as had not been gathered from among the Beasts of the Field. And toward the end of the Paper the Author directs his lines to *All People*. But leaving every one to judge of that Paper

Paper as they find cause, since you lay so great a stress upon it, I shall take at least so much notice of it, as to let you see it doth not answer your design.

First then I observe, in pag. 79. That some of these Dogs which were sent to gather the flock, seeing some of the Sheep *lag behind*, and not keep up with the flock, did run from the flock with fierceness after the Sheep that staid behind, and did frighten the Sheep further away; and the reason of the Sheeps running further off is given thus, *For the Sheep did not understand that the Dogs would have had them to the rest of the flock, but were afraid of the Dogs.* The Dogs then it seems would have had them to the rest of the flock, but the fault was in the *awkwardness* of those stragling Sheep, that did not understand their duty. For that which the Dogs endeavoured to do, was but what their Master the Shepherd sent them for, *viz.* To bring those straglers to the rest of the flock (*for it seems they were Separarists*) so that what the Dogs would have brought them to, was *their proper place*, and they ought to have gone to that (the Fold) which the Dogs laboured to bring them to. But those Sheep having let in a *groundless* Fear, and thereby lost the right understanding of their duty, which was to have run to the rest of the flock (as both the Shepherd and the Dogs would have had them) ran *quite the wrong way*, further from the flock, among the Briers and Thorns, where they lost their Wooll, and so their *Scabbiness* came to be discovered, as that Paper declares, pag. 79, 80. Thus they that take liberty to rove and *ramble from the flock*, going *out of the Unity*, and from the footsteps of the Companions, grow *jealous* and fearful without cause of those whom Christ himself immediatly sends forth to bring them back to the flock again, and in the fearfulnes and mistrust *scattering further*, they come to be torn and suffer loss. That therefore which in this Paper is most pertinent to you, and worthy to be observed by you, is, First, That the Dogs *were sent* immediatly by the Shepherd, to bring those straglers to the rest of the flock, and so to the Fold. 2. That the Sheep through a *false* fear were *cross* and awkward, and would not be brought back to the flock, but ran *further off* among the Briers and Thorns. 3. That the Dogs had *no intention* at all to *Hurt* or *Worry* the Sheep, or to drive them the *wrong way*, or run them into any danger. 4. That that which the Dogs would have brought the Sheep to (if they would have

been ruled) was so far from being hurtful or dangerous to the Sheep, that it was very proper for them, and nothing else but what their Master the Shepherd had appointed for the Sheep, and sent the Dogs on purpose to bring them to. So that the Dogs did not run of their own heads, or in their own wills, neither did they pursue their own Inventions, or follow their own humours; but laboured to accomplish what their Master sent them for. And therefore, 5. That it was the duty of the Sheep to have gone that way which the Dogs took pains to drive them. In short that the Dogs would have had them run the right way, and they took head and would run the wrong. The application is very easie: Take therefore your Parable and make the best on't. Only let me recommend to your Consideration the danger of *Stragling* from the flock, and of letting in *False Fears* and *Jealousies* of those who are sent to gather to the flock, which are not Dogs (*for without are Dogs*) Rev. 22. 15. but True Ministers of Christ. But to proceed.

Sett. 21. In pag. 86. From some Friends Charging J. S. and J. W. with slighting the Heavenly motion on G. F's Spirit, you infer that, in their sense, a slighting G. Fox's Rules, Methods and Orders, with respect to Church-Government, is a slighting of the Cause of God. But though you say, This is evident to you, yet this is an evident falshood in you: For those Friends did not say, slighting G. F's Rules, &c. But expressly thus [slighting the Heavenly motion on G. F's Spirit, &c.] Now to slight the Heavenly motion on the Spirit of G. F. or any other Friend in Truth, Is a slighting of the Cause of God; and they that keep their Habitation in the Truth, cannot but be concerned thereat, and in the Heavenly motion, stand up in defence thereof, against all such as slight the Heavenly motion in any.

In pag. 87. You set down John Story's sense, touching such things which G. F. had given forth on this wise, viz. That he did not believe that G. F. intended any such thing, that they (meaning his Payers directed to the Churches) should with severity be urged upon any of Gods Faithful People, but as Instructions or Directions, commended them to the Churches, leaving the effect thereof to God, and his leading Grace in his People, to make use thereof as he should manifest a need of such Direction, Counsell or Advice. To this Sense of John Story's you say, Robert Barrow, and eight persons Reply-
ed,

ed, a part whereof, you say, was on this wise: *Truly thy darkness and blindness is easie to be felt, and they must be very dim of sight that see thee not: Oh! the Confusion thy dark Spirit is in.* This you say is a part of their Reply; but what was the other part? why have you concealed that? is this fair dealing, to leave out that part, wherein probably the force and strength of their Reply lay, and publish only this, which seems rather a Judgment and Censure of J. S. his Spirit, than a Reply to his words? Can you look upon this without Blushing? This is so like *Hicks* the Baptist, as if you had Copied it out of his Dialogues. He, To prove the Quaker no Christian, used to take a part of Friends words and leave out the other part, that so he might render Friends ridiculous, and give himself an easie advantage of insulting over them. And you have taken the same course, and trod in his steps: For here you say, *This answer seems so very dark, as if blindness were the Lot of their Inheritance, who so writ.* But if this was base, dishonest dealing in *Hicks* a profess Enemy, 'tis worse in you who are pretended (though false) Friends. And surely, had not Envy put out the Right Eye, and thereby brought blindness on you, you would never have done this.

In pag. 91. You run again into great Confusion: For you joyn together a *Conscientious* slighting of *George Fox's* pretended Motions (as you falsely call them) with respect to Forms of Church Government, imposed (you say) contrary to Faith, and a charitable belief, that he intended not to urge his Papers relating thereto on any of God's Faithful People with Severity, which (you say) is no less than an inforcing. So that here is imposing and not imposing, inforcing and not inforcing. Here you Charge and deny, Accuse and acquit; here you express a charitable belief of what you Conscientiously slight, and a Conscientious slighting what you express a Charitable belief of.

You close this first part of your Book with several pages of Railing Accusations against G. F. (the common Butt of your, and all Apostates Envy) wherein ye spare no pains, by Reproaches, Revilings, Falshoods, Slanders, grounded upon Report and Hearsay, as well as your own imaginations and Suggestions, to blemish, stain, defame (if ye could) the good Name, Credit and Reputation which he deservedly hath amongst the People of the Lord. But the ground of your undertaking is seen to be Envy, and the Fruit thereof is Shame to your selves:

For the Lord hath exalted him in the Dominion of Life, above ~~the~~ the reach of Detracting Tongues, and hath given him an Honourable place in the Love and esteem of the Upright Hearted; so that none of the Dirt you sling will stick, unless it be to your own Fingers.

CHAP. IV.

Sell. 1. **I** come now to the second part of your Book, in which you say are *laid down the Doctrines of Truth*. But as the ground of your undertaking to treat of Doctrines was utterly wrong, namely an evil jealousy that the Doctrine of Christianity hath suffered shipwrack amongst the People called *Quakers*; and that therefore a Testimony to the Principles of Truth (anciently held forth amongst them) was needful to be revived (as is scandalously suggested in the Preface, *pag.* 32. and in the 1 part. of the Book *pag.* 69.) so the success hath been answerable. Instead of *clearing* the Doctrines of Truth, you have rather *clouded* and obscured them. And in some you have shewed an *unsound* mind and a *corrupt* judgement, as in its proper place I shall endeavour to shew you. But inasmuch as the most of this Second Part relates to the World (as by the many Objections therein raised appears) I shall not need to stay long in it, being willing to let slip many passages justly to be excepted against, and only touch some particulars wherein you either err from Truth, or joyn with the world against Friends.

In *pag.* 11. You say, *The Doctrine of Infallibility, held by the People called Quakers, hath been accounted ridiculous: because either Occasion hath been given through weakness amongst them, or taken, by their Opponents (whether given or no) to assert, that the People called Quakers are infallible.* And again you say, *Be it as it is, such a bare Assertion, without distinction or explication must be either the fruit of Weakness, if proceeding from any really of that People called Quakers, or else slander and envy, if proceeding from their Opposers without occasion given them so to say.* Here I observe how ready you are to impute *Weakness* to the *Quakers*. One would think it would better have become your

your Profession, if you had known any *such Weakness* amongst the *Quakers* to have endeavoured to have *covered* it from the eye of the World, than thus to surmise a weakness on purpose to expose them to the *scorn* of the World. And doubtless had you not been nearer in spirit to the World, than to the *Quakers* you would not have taken this course. But as you say it *must be the fruit of slander and envy, if proceeding from our Opposers without occasion given them*, so it can be no other than the fruit of Envy in you, to let fly such a slanderous suggestion upon an *IF*, without any occasion given you so to do.

The like course you take in pag. 12. where making an Objection as from the World's people against Friends, you say, *How can it be proved that there is an infallibility accompanying the inward senses of the inward man, seeing many have pretended to give true infallible judgment, from their inward sense, which hath proved notoriously wrong, &c.* To which you answer, *It must be confessed (if any should so object) 'tis very true.* Truly you are very officious to Truth's Opposers, who are so ready, *unask'd*, suggest unto them what they may object against Truth's Friends. You had not patience its seems to stay till the World did object this, but lest they should not have confidence to make such an Objection, you lead them and encourage them to it, by telling them, *IF any should so object, it must be confessed 'tis very true.* Do you know this to be true, very true, and that of many? If you are conscious to your selves that you have so done, your Confession is the more excusable; but then you should have restrained it to your selves: For I must tell you, *such a bare Confession without Explication or Application, must be* (as you said but now, in the other case) *either the fruit of Weakness, or else of slander and Envy.* And though you would be taken for Friends, and introduce your discourse (first Part pag. 2.) with [*Dear Friends and Brethren*] yet 'tis manifest by your work that you are Enemies to Friends, and are turn'd Accusers of the Brethren; and (I verily believe) falsely too.

Sett. 2. In pag. 13. You quarrel at an Assertion, which you say hath been common, *That the Church of Christ is infallible, and cannot err.* To this you say may be said, *That since the Apostacy centred, it is not unknown what visible and outwardly glorious Church hath publish'd this Doctrine, with Application to her self;*

self; by which door, a body of darkness, Usurpation and Persecution hath entred, &c. The misapplication of this Doctrine to a false Church, makes not the Doctrine either the less sound or less fit to be applied to the true Church. Neither is the Doctrine the Door by which a body of darkness, Usurpation and Persecution hath entred, but the *misapplication* of that Doctrine to a false Church, and that in the Apostacy; which ought not to be urged against the true Church after the Apostacy. And questionless the Apostle took the Church of Christ to be infallible, when he not only called it the Church which is in God, 1 The. 1. 1. but also, *The pillar and ground of Truth*, 1 Tim. 3. 15. But I indeed go no further to stop your mouths than your own acknowledgment in the same page, for you say, *We must acknowledge, that that Church which is built on the Rock Christ, cannot (whilst abiding on the Rock) be prevailed against*. But can it be the Church of Christ unless it abide on the Rock? If not, then it follows from your own acknowledgment that the Church of Christ cannot be prevailed against, which is the same as to say, It cannot err; for if it err, it is prevailed against. But of this more hereafter.

In pag. 14. You have another Objection, which you make for the World against the Doctrine of Perfection, and therein you bring in the Objecters, saying, *This perfect state which you speak of, we readily confess unto, so far as the mind of the Spirit is signified unto us therein*. But do the World's people expect the signification of the Mind of the Spirit unto them? or own that any such thing is to be received? Do not they that deny the Doctrine of Perfection, deny the Doctrine of Inspiration also? How came you then to make them that deny the one, confess the other? Is not this a sign you were in confusion?

Sett. 3. In pag. 21. You begin a Chapter touching Wisdom and Knowledge? and you not only say here that *Wisdom without distinction is preach'd against*, but in Part 4. pag. 92, 98, and 102. W. Rogers speaks of some that have preach'd against *All Wisdom and All reasoning*. Yet to manifest the Confusion you are in, and how apt you are to contradict your selves, you say (in this 2 Part pag. 28.) *It hath been much observed, that when the aforesaid Doctrine hath been by some declared, it hath been by way of reflection on the Wisdom and knowledge, which some of the* Pub-

publishers thereof, account Sensual and devillish. Was this without distinction? Are not those words [sensual and devillish] the very express terms the Apostle uses (Jam. 3.) to distinguish the Wisdom that is from beneath from that which is from above? How manifest a contradiction is this! Nay in the very same Sentence pag. 21. wherein you affirm that Wisdom without distinction is preach'd against, you plainly prove the contrary. Your words lye thus, Experience tells us that Wisdom without distinction is so much preach'd against that many ignorant People are even set on float, uttering their folly and confusion in a boasting self Conceited Spirit, as if it were sufficient Evidence, that they are good Christians and in the feeling of the power of God and life of Christianity, because they have confidence enough to cry against Wisdom, and have so much memory, as from the mouths of others to use the words of that wise Apostle Paul when he said, The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. They then it seems whom you charge with preaching against Wisdom without distinction, did by your own confession preach against the Wisdom of this World expressly: was not that a plain distinction? What plainer distinction could they have used? Or what plainer Evidence could you have given of self-contradiction and confusion, then to tell us in one line they preach'd against Wisdom without distinction, and yet in the next line tells us, that when they so preach'd they used the words of the Apostle Paul, The Wisdom of this world is foolishness with God? May I not hereupon say of you, as you do of others (pag. 22.) Had you had less folly and confidence, you would not have brought forth such falsehood, confusion and self-contradiction, in a bitter, envious spirit; which things being earthly, sensual and devillish, are (as you say) the very marks of that Wisdom that descendeth not from above.

But your aim I perceive is to exalt and magnify the Creaturely wisdom: For you say pag. 22. *As a further illustration of what is aimed at in this discourse, we now come to signify; that some have a far greater portion of Wisdom, Knowledge and Understanding than others, (which in Part 1. pag. 22. and else where, you care fully apply to your own party) and that it's given them of God, as they are Creatures, distinct from what they are, when acted by a good Spirit or bad, &c. Yet such (you say) is the ignorance of this Age, as to account this portion of Wisdom, Knowledge or Understanding (as we are Creatures) to be that Wisdom which the*
Apostle

Apostle termed Earthly, Sensual and Devillish, or the wisdom of this World, or the wisdom of the Wise; which the Lord by the Apostle Paul hath said he will destroy. To this I Answer, that this Creaturely Wisdom, Knowledge or Understanding, while moving within its own Sphear, it is exercised in the Fear of God, about the things of the Creation, is not condemned: But when this wisdom intrudes into the things of Gods Kingdom, and will needs be meddling with *Divine Mysteries*, which being of a Spiritual Nature, are out of the reach of the Creaturely Wisdom, and are only Spiritually discernable, then is it justly condemned; and that torments and vexes you, as it doth the Priests and Professors, who being ignorant of the Divine Wisdom, and puffed up with a fond Conceit of their *Natural* knowledge and Creaturely understanding, have the same aim that you seem to have in this Discourse, viz. To have the handling and management of the things of Gods Kingdom in and with the Creaturely Wisdom. And whereas you tax *this Age with Ignorance*, in accounting this Creaturely Wisdom that which the Apostle termed *Earthly, Sensual and Devillish*; I think you do this Age wrong: For the Error of this Age hath lain on the other hand, in setting up the Natural or Creaturely Wisdom above its place, and putting it even in the room of the Divine Wisdom. But if by [this Age] you mean Friends, whom you are willing to take occasion to brand with Ignorance, for depressing and too much depreiating (as you may think) this Creaturely Wisdom, Knowledge and Understanding, which you would be thought to have a far greater portion of than others. Then let me tell you, That that which in *Jam. 3. 15.* is rendred sensual, is in the Greek [*ψυχικὴ*] *Animal or Natural*, which being joyned to and used by the *Evil One*, becomes also *Devillish*. So that you may, if you please, read that place in *James* thus, *This Wisdom descendeth not from Above, but is Earthly, Natural and Devillish.* The same word is used by the Apostle Paul, *1 Cor. 2. 14.* and chap. *15. 44, 46.* In all which places it is rendred in the *English* [*Natural*] and in *Jude 19.* where it is used again, though in the latter Translations it be rendred [*Sensual*] yet in *Tomson's Translation of Beza's Latin* (Printed in the year 1589.) it is rendred [*Natural* ;] and the Apostle himself, to shew that he meant thereby men in their *Natural State*, adds [*not having the Spirit* ;] *Jude 19.* But it is pretty kind of Reason you give why

why that wisdom, knowledge or understanding, which we have as Creatures, cannot be that which the Lord by the Apostle Paul hath said he will destroy, viz. *Because that it is the proper gift of God, and a part of his own Creation, and is honourable in its place, and it is against the Nature of the Divine Being to destroy this Wisdom, because it is his own Gift, even as it is against his Nature to destroy the Lives of men, &c.* But how Honourable soever this Wisdom be in its place, yet surely it is not Honourable out of its place. While it is kept in its place, it is not condemned; but when it is abused, and put to a wrong use (as it is when its made the Key to the Mysteries of Gods Kingdom) it is then just with God to destroy it, as he sometimes doth the Lives also of men, when corrupted; of which we have a great Instance in Noah's Flood, wherein both the *Understandings* and *Lives* of all Mankind (excepting only Noah's Family) were at once by God destroyed together.

In pag. 23. You undertake to tell us what the Apostle meant by the *Wisdom of the World*, the *Wisdom of the Wise*, and the *Wisdom of Words*: All which you make to be the *Fruits of Education* and acquired Parts. And those things which in that day were given forth by the *Scribes and Pharisees*, and other *Disputers* against that *Divine Appearance*, you say, (pag. 24.) You do not take to be the *Natural Effects* of that *Wisdom, Knowledge or Understanding* given unto them, as *Creatures*; but rather (being in the state of *Degeneration*) as the *Fruits of their Education and acquired Parts*, wherewith being not subject to the appearance of *Christ*, they then became *Opposers of the Truth*. I Answer, *Human Wisdom*, whether *Acquired or Natural*, may properly be called, *The Wisdom of the World*, which if subjected to and guided by the *Divine Wisdom or understanding*, which the *Inspiration of the Almighty* gives, is serviceable and commendable: But if joyed to, mixed with and guided by the *Serpentine subtilty*, becomes both *Devillish*, *Hurtful* and *Condemnable*: And truly I think you will find it very difficult (if at all possible) to distinguish clearly, by the fruits or Effects between *Natural* and *Acquired Wisdom*: For what man is there (how mean soever though he be wholly a stranger to Books, and can neither Write nor Read what is Written) that has not by *Converse*, by *Observation*, by *Experience*, &c. improved (in some degree) his *Natural Understanding*? Nor can it agree with *Truth or Reason*,

son, that the Opposition made by the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, should be the product or Fruits of their Education and acquired parts *only* (as here you seem to take it) distinct and abstract from their Creaturely Wisdom, Knowledge and Understanding, since it is not possible for any man to acquire Knowledge by Education, or to use it being acquired, without the concurrence and exercise of his Natural or Creaturely Understanding. So that it must be taken for the Fruits of both their Natural and Acquired Wisdom conjunctly, by which, not being subject to the appearance of Christ, they became opposers of the Truth, as many others since have been, and *you now are*.

Having pleaded thus hard for the Creaturely Wisdom, or that Wisdom which men have as they are Creatures, you now come to your Conclusion thus. *To conclude*, say you, *Solomon in his day magnified Wisdom at a high rate, who did undoubtedly account it the sign of a Just man, and therefore said, The mouth of the Just bringeth forth Wisdom. The Apostle in his day did magnifie Wisdom, exhorting the Saints to walk in Wisdom. Christ the Son of God testified, Wisdom is justified of her Children. Strange! did you bring these Texts to confirm or confute your Opinion? How could you imagine that any of these had relation to the Creaturely Wisdom? Consider them each by it self and see your own want of Wisdom. Solomon, you say, did undoubtedly account Wisdom the sign of a Just man: But undoubtedly he did not account the Creaturely Wisdom a sign of a Just man, for the Unjust have of that Wisdom, as well as the Just* (Christ said, *The Children of this World are in their Generation wiser than the Children of Light*, Luk. 168.) *The mouth of the Just brings forth Wisdom: But what Wisdom doth it bring forth, the Wisdom which men have as they are Creatures? The mouth of the Unjust can bring forth that. The same Solomon says, Prov. 3. 5. Lean not to thy own Understanding. The Apostle, you say, exhorts the Saints to walk in Wisdom; True, but in what Wisdom? The Wisdom which they had as men, or as Saints? The same Apostle saith elsewhere, The World by Wisdom knew not God, 1 Cor. 1. 21. And we see to this day, that none of all the Wise men of the World, are able by their Natural Wisdom, which they have as Creatures (nor by their Acquired Wisdom neither) to attain the right and true knowledge of God. Nay the Apostle says expressly, 1 Cor. 2. 14. The Natural man perceiveth not the things*

Things of the Spirit of God: For they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are Spiritually discerned: And yet some Natural men have as great a Portion of that Wisdom which men have, as they are Creatures, as some Spiritual men have. Now do you think the Apostle exhorted the Saints to walk in that Wisdom, which they could neither know God, nor perceive the Things of the Spirit of God? Christ, you say, Testified, Wisdom is justified of her Children. He did so: but what Wisdom was that, think you? The Creaturely Wisdom? what are the Children of the Creaturely Wisdom? I hope by this time you see how impertinently you have urged these Scriptures, and with how little Wisdom you have treated of Wisdom. You declare so loudly against ignorance, and folly, folly and ignorance, as if you thought every body fools but your selves. Had Job had to do with you, he might have said to you, as he did to some who pretended a great deal of Friendship to him; No doubt but ye are the People; and Wisdom shall dye with you, Job 12. 2. But others have understanding as well as you and are not inferior to you, what ever you may think of your selves. It would be safer for you to take the Counsel of the Apostle to the Romans, Be not wise in your own conceits, Chap. 12. 16. Left ye be found in the state of those of whom he speaks, Chap. 1. 22. professing themselves to be wise, became fools.

You are sure, you say, the Apostles writings encourage none to cry down Wisdom at the rate 'tis of late, without distinction exclaimed against by some. But 1. Are you sure that it is exclaimed against by any without distinction: for I have proved from your own confessions in this very Chapter, that those you charge with crying down Wisdom, have distinguished what Wisdom it is they decry. But 2. If that had not been; if there had not been any express distinction made but only implied in the scope and tendency of the matter delivered, could you have thought it fair from thence to infer that they intended to cry down, All Wisdom. The Apostle Paul doth frequently cry up Wisdom, yet doth not in express words distinguish it in all places where he speaks of it. Will ye therefore exclaim against the Apostle for crying up all Wisdom without distinction? None but an evil mind could suggest that the Apostle intended to cry up that Wisdom is devilish and from below; nor would

would ever any good mind imagine that Friends would cry down that Wisdom that is divine and from above.

You say pag. 25. *This ignorance we don't hath hapned unto many, not only from a Principle of having their Eyes out unto man, but also from a neglect to read the Scriptures of Truth, &c.* To which I answer, your own Ignorance and want of Charity hath led you into this doubting, and doubting into flandering God's people with being principled to have their eyes out unto man, and with neglecting to read the Scriptures of Truth; In both which you are false Accusers of the Brethren.

Concerning the word *Knowledge*, you have an addition, as little to the purpose as the text. You say, *That in the want thereof in dayes past, those who are escaped of the nations set up their Graven-Images, according as Isaiah the Prophet testified, They have no Knowledge, that set up the word of their Graven-Images, and pray unto a God that cannot save.* And you say, at this day the words of the Prophet are again fulfilling, *My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge; because thou hast rejected knowledge, I also will reject thee.* What knowledge was it that they wanted? Was it the knowledge given them as Creatures distinct from what they were when acted by a good Spirit or a bad? Nay had they not the Creaturely knowledge; and yet the Prophet says they have No knowledge. Will you thence infer the Prophet denied all knowledge without distinction? Neither were they whom Hosea speaks of chap. 4. 6. destroyed for lack of the Creaturely knowledge, but of the divine knowledge, the knowledge of God and his Law, as both the first verse of that Chapter, and the latter part of the 6. verse (which in quoting the verse, you have left out) do plainly shew.

Here you insinuate that many have appear'd ready to exalt man, to have an eye to men, and (in neglect of that heavenly gift which is given unto mankind) to bow in their hearts unto men, as having a dependency on the dictates, Prescriptions, Orders, and outward Rules of man. And this, you say, under the dispensation of the Gospel of Christ, *We take to be as great a falling away from the Truth, as the setting up of a Graven-Image (through the want of knowledge) was under the law.* This is a foul slander, which, had you not been fallen from Truth, you durst not have suggested. But your Hearts are filled with Envy, and your Tongues are unbridled, and you regard not what reproach you

you cast on those you hate. But the Lord will avenge his people, and your slanders will be your own burden.

In pag. 27. You say, *The word of knowledge is one of the gifts, which through the manifestation of the Spirit are given unto every man to profit himself.* But in this too you err: for though the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man, yet the gifts mentioned in the text you quote (1 Cor. 12.) Are not given to every man; but some to one man, some to another, verſ. 7, 8, 9, 10. as the Giver pleases, verſe 11.

In pag. 28. From a Clause in an Objection intimating as if the Religion of some were in their heads and not in their hearts, You take Occasion to say, *Pure Religion and undefiled is to visit the fatherless and the Widows, and to keep unsported of the World;* wherein if your heads be not exercised, your hearts (you say,) will not bring forth the fruit thereof. This does not answer the Objection: for the objection was not concerning their heads being exercised in Religion, but their Religion being in their heads, and not in their hearts. Now it is one thing to have the head exercised by the powerful influence of Religion in the heart, and another thing to have the Religion seated and rooted in the head, or Notional part. The one stands in the pure living feeling of the motion of the word and spirit of life in the heart: the other consists in a wise, comprehensive grasping of Religious notions in the head. But you are very uncertain and inconsistent: for though here you do not deny the Objection, but rather yield to it, pleading for the exercise of your heads in Religion; yet in pag. 69. you reflect upon others as holding, *That a little Religion in the head, might lead a man more, than a great deal in the heart.* And in 3. Part pag. 38 (and frequently else where) you affirm, *That the only proper place where Christ's Government is to be exalted, is in the heart.*

Another part of the Objection was, *That the Tree of knowledge was not good for food.* This you oppose; which shews you are for feeding on that knowledge, which Adam was forbidden to eat of. You say, *the Scriptures do not positively say whether it was good for food or no, as in its self.* The Scripture saith, Gen. 3. 6. *The woman saw that the Tree was good for food;* but she saw this with that eye which the Serpent opened in her: for it is observable that she did not see it good for food, till she had reasoned with the Devil. And had not you consulted with him too,

too, you would not have thought that *good for food*, which God in the beginning did not think good to permit Man to eat of. It was the *subtil Serpent* first preach'd that *the Tree of knowledge was good for food*: but *Adam* quickly found the contrary, by sad experience: For by eating of the *Tree of knowledge*, he was barred from the *Tree of life*, and turned out of the Garden of God. You may do well therefore to consider *whose Disciples you are*, and of whom you learn't this Doctrine, *That the Tree of knowledge is good for food*. God himself forbade it None of the holy men of God, under either Testament approved it. None but the Divil (that we read of) *advised* the feeding on it, and *Adam* lost Paradise by it. You make as if there was nothing in it, but *Adam's* disobeying God's Command, and as if that Tree had been as good for food as any of the rest, had it not been forbidden. But *was it forbidden without cause?* or can you assign and prove any other cause why it was forbidden, besides the nature of the fruit, which was not good for food? Again, you seem to infer, from the Similitude of a father's forbidding his child to eat an apple, and yet giving him leave to eat other food fitter at that season for him, that the prohibition was but for a season, and that the fruit then forbidden might at another season be eaten. But these are but groundless conjectures, neither proved, nor proveable. The *Apostle Paul* some thousand years after that Prohibition, tells you the nature of *knowledge*, that it *puffs up*, 1 Cor. 8. 1. and nothing that puffs up is good for food. But to prove the Tree of knowledge good for food, you urge the words of Christ, *John* 17. 3. *This is life eternal that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* And you add, *'Tis evident, that knowledge is the way to life.* But are you so void of the true knowledge as to think the knowledge Christ spake of was the fruit of that Tree which God did forbid *Adam* to eat of? Do you think he forbade him to taste of that knowledge which is the way to life; nay, which is *life eternal*? Had you considered that *Adam* by eating of the Tree of knowledge did *lose* life and *found* death, you would never have taken that knowledge which is (or brings) eternal life, to be the fruit of that Tree that *Adam* eat of. Yet you say, *These things being considered, You know not on what foot of Truth any one can assert (nay you go further, and positively affirm, it may reasonably be concluded, that there is no ground to assert) that the Tree of*

know-

knowledge of good and evil was not good for food, as in it self. But though you know not on what foot of Truth this may be asserted, and therefore conclude (and as you think reasonably too) that there is no ground so to conclude, yet they that have kept their habitation in the Truth have known and do know a ground in Truth to assert. And they who have stood in the *Counsel of God*, and have received *the mind of the Lord*, have testified in the *openings of life*, and by the *Revelation of the Spirit of Truth*, that the *Tree of knowledge was not good for food*. And therefore since you talk so much of *Truth in the beginning*, and pretend to write this 2. part of your Book to *revive* (as you express it in your Preface, pag. 32.) *a Testimony to the Principles of Truth, antiently held forth*; I must put you in mind, that this which you now oppose is the *antient Testimony* which Friends have born *from the beginning*. This might be proved by many Instances, but because *F. Horgill* was an early, an eminent and faithful labourer in the Lords Vine-yard in this latter day, and one who (as you speak of *E. Burrough*, Pref. pag. 40.) is honourably spoken of (and very deservedly) by some, if not by all, of both parties, I chose to give you a convincing Evidence out of his writings in a Treatise which he writ, called *The invisible things of God brought to light by the Revelation of the eternal spirit*, &c. Printed in the year 1659. speaking of the Tree of knowledge, pag. 20. (in his works together, it is pag. 136) he thus saith, "Now the Tree of Knowledge was good in the powers motion, though not to lieve upon or for food, for *IT WAS NOT GOOD FOR FOOD*; therefore God, the Truth, the Life, the Power, did forbid to Taste of it, or Eat of that Tree. Here then you see this was the Testimony of Truth *two and Twenty* years ago, and that by the Revelation of the Eternal Spirit; and therefore you are so far from *reviving the Ancient Testimony*, that you are opposing, gain-saying, destroying it. So that it appears by this that you are the *Apostates and Innovators*, who are gone from the *Ancient Testimony*, and are introducing a new Doctrine contrary thereunto.

Seet. 4. In pag. 43. Treating of Tythes, you raise an Objection thus, But what if it please the Supream Powers to bestow on the National Ministry Tythes? How prove you from the Scriptures, that those who freely pay it do ill, or that 'tis not lawfull for them

to.

to receive it from such, and sue for it by the Law from others, who are not free to pay it? You Answer, We are so far from condemning all those who freely pay them, and not as by constraint, that we look upon it to be the duty of all professing Christianity to contribute toward the outward maintenance of such whom they usually hear, and account to be the true Ministers of Christ, &c. In this Answer you discover an Error of Judgment, and that you are of an unsound mind in this particular also; otherwise you would not be so far from condemning all those who pay Tythes freely, as you say you are. Truth allows no payment of Tythes at all under the New Covenant, but condemns it, and so would you also were your hearts right in Truth. They who pay Tythes, do therein uphold a Legal Ceremony, abrogated by Christ, and thereby deny Christ to be come in the flesh, which is a mark of Antichrist, 1 Joh. 4. 3. And are you far from condemning this! 'Tis a sign you are far from a right and grounded knowledge and understanding of Truth, and zeal for Truth (though you talk so much of both) and are in that state you speak of (1 Part pag. 69, 70.) *Abounding in Confidence, without either (True) Knowledge or Zeal.* If you are so far from condemning them that pay Tythes, it may well be thought you are not very far from paying Tythes your selves. And Thomas Crisp, a busy Agent in your Cause, (and one that has taken Encouragement from your Book to publish several Scandalous Pamphlets against Truth and Friends) hath lately declared that he pays Tythes, and that the Spirit of God did or might allow him to pay Tythes, or Marry by a Priest, (as he also did) and yet says the same Spirit of God, might require another not to pay them, &c. How far you'll be from condemning this, time will shew. However, whether you condemn or approve it, the Faithful followers of the Lamb, they that keep their habitation in the Truth, and their Eye single in the Light of Christ Jesus, see and discern this Spirit, what it is, and what it aims at; the Nature of it, the Instruments it appears in and works through; the means it uses, and the end it tends to, which is downright Rantersim.

Self. 5. In the next Chapter you Treat of Baptism, but with so many ups and downs, so in and out, so wavering and uncertain, that it is hard to find what you would beat. In pag. 45. you say (and that rightly) *It doth not appear from Mat. 28. 19. That*

That the Disciples were thereby Commissionated to Baptize with Water. But then in pag. 46. you say, You would not be understood positively to affirm, that Christ intended not a Baptism of Water; So that for all your high pretences to knowledge, you don't know it seems whether he intended Water Baptism or no. All your Feeding on the Tree of Knowledge has not given you an understanding in this Case; but you float and waver, not knowing what to say, nor whereof to affirm. You take it (pag. 47.) to be clearly imported, that Water-Baptism was used, as well after the Crucifying of Christ, as before: But whether by virtue of any command from Christ so to do, is yet (you say) the Question, and uncertain from any positive Scripture. So that whether that use of Water-Baptism you speak of, was grounded on Christs Commission, or on his Intendant only, or on both, or on neither; it seems you don't know, with all your Creaturely Wisdom, Knowledge and Understanding. But what you want in Knowledge, you have in Confidence: For though you know not this, yet you have Confidence enough to suppose it. However, (say you) Suppose that the Baptism of Water was the Baptism intended by Christ in the words, Go teach all Nations, Baptising them, &c. But since you say it is uncertain from any positive Scripture, that Water-Baptism was used, as well after the Crucifying of Christ, as before, by virtue of any Command from Christ; what ground, I pray, have you to admit a supposition, that the Baptism of Water was the Baptism intended by Christ in the words, Go teach all Nations, Baptising them, &c. Yet this is not the greatest part of the absurdity you run into: For upon this Supposition, you say, It seems naturally to follow, that this (supposed Institution of Water-Baptism) was but a Confirmation of John's Ministry, and that (being a legal Ministration) but for a season, and not to the end of the World. To say nothing here of the Legality of John's Ministration, have not you drawn a strange Conclusion, That (according to your admitted Supposition) the Baptism which Christ Instituted in Mat. 28. was but a Confirmation of John's decreasing Ministry, and that but for a Season, and not to indure to the end of the World? Were the Apostles then to Preach the Gospel to all Nations (which is a connected part of the same Commission) only for a Confirmation of John's Ministry, and was Christ to be with his Church for a Season only, and not to the end of the World? Away with all such Suppositions,

sit' ons from which such consequents naturally follow ! But you have more *Confusion* yet, in your uncertain conjectures about this matter. For another Limb of your Natural consequence, from your admitted Supposition that the Baptism of Water was the Baptism intended by Christ in *Mat. 28.* is this, *That it was not that Baptism wherewith John testified Christ should Baptize, which was with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire:* Which is as much to the purpose, as if you had said in so many Syllables [The Baptism with *Water* is not the Baptism with the Holy Ghost and with *Fire:*] Which the darkeſt of Priests, I ſuppoſe, never took it to be. The *Reason* too you give for this, is far enough remote from Reason in all reason, although you introduce it with an [Eſpecially] *Eſpecially* (ſay you) *if we do but conſider, That Chriſt was not yet aſcended, after which the Promise of the Father was to be fulfilled, viz. The pouring forth of the Holy Ghost, which undoubtedly was the Baptism of the Spirit.* But if you had better conſidered, you might have found, that the Holy Ghost's being not then actually poured forth, could be no reasonable Bar to Chriſt, to obſtruct his inſtituting his *Spiritual Baptism* at that time, any more than it was to his giving Commiſſion then to his Apoſtles to *Preach the Goſpel*, which (though then commanded) they were not to do till they had received the *Promise of the Father, the pouring out of the Spirit*, which they were commanded to wait for (*Luke 24.49.*) that thereby they might be (as indeed they were) fitly enabled for the work, as well of *Baptizing* as *Teaching*. Yet from theſe Premises, duly weighed, you think, it's rational to conclude that the Baptism of Water ought to end in time. A very Rational Conclusion no doubt it is, and not to be denied by any the greateſt Contenders for Water Baptiſm: For *Water* being it ſelf an *Element* that muſt end in time, it were ridiculous enough for any to imagine it poſſible for the Baptiſm therewith to extend beyond time. You add, *And that theſe words, And lo I am with you unto the end of the World, are no ſufficient ground to believe that the Baptism of Water was thereby intended to continue as an Ordinance of God, unto the Diſſolution of all things.* You make no doubt then but Water Baptiſm was intended by Chriſt in that Commiſſion, *Mat. 28. 19.* but not to continue to the diſſolution of all things. But what ground have you to believe (as you ſeem to do) that Water Baptiſm was intended at all in that Commiſſion? Only becauſe the

the Priests tell you so: The Scripture *you confess* does not say so: Yet you cannot forbear inferring it over and over. In *pag. 48* you say again, *Christ did not by the Commission intend a continuation of that administration [of Water-Baptism] unto the end of the World*; which implies you hold, that Christ did by that Commission intend Water-Baptism, though not to continue it to the Worlds end. But in *pag. 49* you run to the height of extravagance, for you say, *There is no reason to conclude, that Christ's Commission to Baptize, was intended to continue as an Ordinance under the Gospel Dispensation, until the Consummation of all things*. This you assert indefinitely, without any explicit relation or restriction to this or that kind of Baptism, but in general terms of Christs Commission to Baptize: So that whatever Baptism Christ commanded in that Commission, *Mat. 28*. whether with Water or the Holy Ghost, you here conclude. *There is no reason to conclude it was intended to continue as an Ordinance under the Gospel Dispensation, until the Consummation of all things*. This Dilemma then you have hereby run your selves upon, either that the Baptism of the Holy Ghost was not the Baptism commanded by Christ in *Mat. 28*. Or that the Baptism of the Holy Ghost was not intended to continue as an Ordinance under the Gospel Dispensation, until the Consummation of all things: Either of which is false Doctrine.

Now to favour this Conceit of yours, ye take occasion to find fault with the Translation of the Text in *Matt. 28. 20*. Which is past your mending. But some folks love to be meddling, and so it seems do you; yet as busie and forward as you are here to put your strange uncouth Meaning and private Interpretation upon the Scripture, you cry out again *pag. 62*. against such as have put their Meanings on the Scripture of Truth; when in truth they cannot say, *That by the Revelation of the Spirit of God they have been led thereto: And therefore such Meanings, you there say, may well be taken to be no other, than meer private Interpretations, and not that which is signified by the Holy Ghost*. And again, *pag. 70*. From the words of the Apostle, *2 Pet. 1. 20, 21*. *No Prophecy of the Scripture is of any private Interpretation; that is, say you, it ought not to be interpreted, but by the Holy Ghost, through whose motion it was given forth; and yet so great, you say, is the Curiosity of men, that they will be concerning themselves to put meanings on the Scriptures of Truth, though the words themselves*

will not warrant the same, nor the Interpreters in truth affirm, That such their meanings are through the Revelation of the Spirit. All this you say against putting Meanings and private Interpretations upon the Scriptures; and yet your selves do it. But let us see what Meaning it is your Curiosity will needs put upon this Scripture, Mat. 28. 20.

You say, pag. 48. The sentence, And lo I am with you always unto the end of the world, may properly be rendred thus, And lo I am with you every day, unto the consummation of the Age. But herein you err. The words in this place may not be properly so rendred. The material difference lies between the words [World] and [Age;] the former being more extensive, the other more restrictive. And had you considered that this sentence contains the promise of Christ's continual presence with his Church (which, as Beza on the place well notes, is meant of the presence of his Spirit, &c.) ye would not I think have been so ready to restrain it to that age by this your private Interpretation, but have admitted him to be present with his People, in the greatest latitude of his promise, *always, even unto the end of the world.*

Besides, As the word [Αἰών] from which you take your Exception, doth sometimes (though but rarely) in Scripture signify an Age, as in *Ephes. 2. 7.* so also is it sometimes taken for the Fabrick of the world, as in *Heb. 1. 2.* and *11. 13.* But for the most part [Κόσμος] is used in this sense, and [Αἰών] where the beginning, duration or end of the world is spoken of Κόσμος more properly relating to the Structure, Αἰών to the Time of the world, as in *John. 9. 32. Acts. 3. 21.* and *15. 18. Mat. 24. 3.* But the difference is more especially observable in *Mat. 13. 35, 38, 39, 40.* In which four verses each word is twice used in its proper signification: for in *vers. 35,* and *38.* where the world it self, and the foundation of it, is spoken of, it is expressed by Κόσμος but in *vers. 39,* and *40.* where the end of the world is spoken of, it is expressed by Αἰών. And in both these places (as also in the 40th. *vers.* of that *Chap.* and in *Mat. 24. 3.*) Σωτήρια τῷ αἰῶνι (the very same words that are used in *Mat. 28. 20.*) are (and must of necessity be) rendred, *The end of the world.* Nor is there any place in all the New Testament, where those words are (or may be, rightly) rendred to another sense. You would indeed render them
other-

otherwise, not only in this place, *Mat. 28.* but in that also of *Heb. 9. 26.* but *falsly*, being led thereto by this consideration, that it is sixteen hundred years since that was written. But you should also have considered that that place *Heb. 9. 26.* is not to be taken *strictly* in point of time, but *figuratively*; the holy Pen-men of the Scripture (though the clear and immediate sight they had, in the opening Vision of the Almighty, beholding things as present, which yet, in point of time, were many Ages distant) sometimes by an *Analogy of Tense*, expressing themselves of time to come, as if it just then were. So *Peter* in his 1 Epistle, chap. 4. vers. 7. says, *The end of all things is at hand* [*ἤγγικε*] as if it were *just at the door*, yet more than 1600 years have since elapsed. And that he there meant the *end* of the world, not only the universality of the words [*all things*] perswades, but the mention of the *judgment of Quick and Dead*, in the verse but one before, plainly proves.

Had you taken these things rightly into consideration, it might haply have prevented your unadvised and over confident asserting, that this *private* Interpretation which you have given is (not only) *according to the Truth*, pag. 48. (but) *the very truth*, pag. 49. when as indeed and in truth it is quite contrary to the Truth, and greatly injurious to the Church of Christ by designing to *restrain the promise of his presence unto that age only*. But in saying (as you do, pag. 49.) *There is no reason to conclude That Christ's Commission to Baptise, was intended to continue as an Ordinance under the Gospel Dispensation, untill the consummation of all things*, you have broached a very erroneous Opinion; which you have fallen into by *muddling your mindes* in the Creaturely knowledge (you so much boast of) whereby you have lost the *divine Understanding* you speak of pag 49. and darkned again the *enlightned Eye* you mention, pag 50. and are now *groping* in the dark, and guessing at things, like other Professors, and are fallen to work to correct the Scriptures with your acquired Parts, with that Wisdom and knowledge (whatever it is) which some of you have attained through Education, and which, but a few leaves before (pag 22.) you call the Wisdom of the world. But blessed be God, there are many to whom He hath indeed given a divine understanding, and in whom he hath enlightned and keeps open an eye, which sees and discerns your Wisdom and knowledge, and the Root thereof, what ground it springs from, and what fruit it bears; whence

whence it comes and whither it tends. God Almighty manifest it more and more unto those whom Satan has made you instrumental to deceive.

You say *More might be written on this subject* (of Baptism) *from the Scriptures of Truth.* No doubt there might: But what you have written is *more than enough*, unless it were *more to the purpose.* I also say, Much more might be written, to evidence that what you have written on this subject is wrong, and not according to the Scriptures, nor the ancient Testimony of Truth, born among Friends in the beginning. But this may be sufficient at present to give the Reader a Taste of your Spirit, and prove you Innovators.

Sett. 6. Yet before I follow you to the next Chapter, I cannot but take notice of one passage more in this. 'Tis in *pag 46.* where you say, *Moreover we put this Query to every enlighten'd impartial Reader, Whether there be not cause to doubt, that the very Disciples themselves might not be as remote from having a true Savour of the meaning of Christ in these words* [Baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost] *as some of Christ's Disciples were, John 6. 53. in these his words* [Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have on life in you.] This is a very Indecent Reflection, not only on the Disciples of Christ, but on Christ himself and the Holy Ghost also. First, on the Disciples, insinuating that they, *after his Resurrection*, should be as remote from a true savour of the meaning of Christ's words (*Mat. 28. 19.*) about Baptism, as those were in another Case (*Joh. 6. 60.*) who though they followed him for a time, thereby obtaining the Name of Disciples, were such as *he knew from the beginning did not believe*, verse 64. and who *quickly turned their backs on him, and left him*, verse 66. This suggestion against the Disciples of Jesus is base, and the worse, because general, without distinction. What! to compare the Disciples of Christ, who *forsook all* for him, who *cleaved close* and adhered *Faithfully* to him, and whom he had *chosen* and *Sanctified* as a *First Fruit* unto himself, to compare these I say to such *formal* Followers of him as *never truly believed in him*, but having followed him a *little while*, quickly took Offence and left him, is far from a true Christian Spirit: *The comparison is odious.* Secondly, this is a reflection upon Christ, in supposing he would, just at parting (as to Bodyly presence) leave his Disciples (by whom

whom he designed to alarm the World with the sound of his Heavenly Gospel, by whom he intended to publish the gladtydings of Salvation, and gather a people out of the Nations to himself) under a *mistake* concerning, or *without a true savour of the meaning of those words*, which were a part of their Commission. This must suppose him either ignorant of their supposed ignorance, or willing to leave them in it; which cannot be supposed without *horrible Impiety*. Thirdly, this is a Reflection on the *Holy Ghost* also; whom Christ told his Disciples the Father would send unto them, to be in and abide with them, not only to be their Comforter, but their *Instructor*, to lead and guide them into *all Truth*, to take of his and *stew* unto them, and to bring to their remembrance *whatsoever* he had said unto them. Now this Commission to Teach Baptizing was his, Christs, he gave it, and he also commanded them to wait for the *pouring forth of the Spirit*, that thereby they might be fitted for the Execution thereof. And they did wait for it, and did receive of it in a plentiful measure. It was poured forth upon them: They were indued (that is clothed or covered) with the Holy Ghost, and with power from on high. And being so, to suppose them ignorant of the meaning of those words, which Christ had given in charge to them, is to suppose the Holy Ghost defective in his Office, and negligent of the Service for which he was sent. Thus have you at once surmised evil, and suggested slander against Christ's Disciples, against the Holy Ghost, and against Christ himself.

Sett. 7. Your next Chapter Touching the Supper of the Lord, &c. wherein again ye bring forth confusion. You say pag. 52. It naturally follows from the words of Christ, Luk. 22. 19. [Do this in remembrance of me] that Christs Disciples were to do something, which he then did, which undoubtedly was you say to give thanks, and break bread in remembrance of him; and you call this a Command. By and by in pag 53. you say 'tis rational to conclude, that in their daily breaking bread from house to house, no other Institution, Ordinance or Sacrament was hinted at then what was neglected toward the Grecian Widows. In pag. 54. you speak against any solemn Institution, made by Christ. But then again in page 58. you make the eating of Bread, and Drinking of Wine to be commanded by Christ, the night before he was Betrayed. So
un-

uncertain a sound does your Trumpet give. Many other passages you have in this Chapter, which might justly be excepted against (as where you say pag 56. *It cannot be inferred that those who worthily did eat of that bread, and drink of that cup mentioned by the Apostle, 1 Cor 11. were after thereceiving thereof made partakers of Christ's body:* which is more than you can prove; but I chuse to over-look them, and the rather because the Subject treated of is a deep Mystery beyond the reach of your highest Creaturely Wisdom and acquired knowledge.

In pag 59. you say, *Christ speaks no more condemnation unto you, as persons, in that respect, (of eating bread and drinking wine) neglecting any thing that he hath instituted for us to practice, than he doth to many Elders of the Church at this day; who visiting the sick, neglect to anoint with Oyle in the name of the Lord.* You use the word Church here without distinction. Elders of what Church do you mean? *The Church* used indefinitely implies the true Church, the Church of Christ; but you must mean (if your discourse have any force in it) the Elders of such a Church as eat bread and drink wine *Sacramentally* (as the term is). But do you own any of the Churches that are in that practice, to be the Church, the true Church, the Church of Christ. If you do, you know what follows. If you do not, you must then by Elders mean Friends. But then the force of your Argument is lost, and besides you make yourselves new work to make good your charge against Friends, that they neglect to anoint with Oyl in the name of the Lord; which before you can convict them of, you must prove that it is their duty to anoint with oyl, &c. For unless it be their duty so to do, their not doing it is no neglect.

Sett. 8. You have one Chapter more in this 2 part of your book, in which you treat of *Justification and Salvation through faith in Christ*. At the entrance thereof lies a long and very perplex Objection, to which in pag. 62. you thus answer, *The Objection (say you) seems to be raised by such, as have put their meanings on the Scriptures of Truth; when in Truth they cannot say, That by the Revelation of the Spirit of God they have been led thereto.* This is very right indeed: For it was by your selves the Objection was raised; so that by your own confession you are such as have put your Meanings on the Scriptures of Truth, Witness your

your altering the text *Mat. 28. 20.* From *Lo I am with you alwayes unto the end of the world* to *Lo I am with you every day unto the consummation of the age* (pag. 48.) when you could not in Truth say, that by the revelation, of the Spirit of God you were led thereunto. And therefore (as you say here) such meanings, may well be taken to be no other, than meer private Interpretations, and not that which is signified by the Holy Ghost.

In pag. 63. You take occasion to speak of Faith, and you say, *The word Faith in the Scripture, may be taken in a twofold sense: the one, you say, is a faith that is not (without a further growth) accompanied with the Salvation of God. Here your Creatively Wisdom hath betrayed you into another Error. For if this faith you speak first of, be a true faith, a faith whereof Christ is the Author, it is accompanied with the Salvation of God, in some measure and degree, though it be but like a grain of Mustard-Seed, very little and of small growth. And if it be not a true faith, a faith whereof Christ is the Author, it will never be accompanied with the Salvation of God, what ever growth it attain unto. If the faith you speak of be twofold in nature, then that faith which is not true, can never by growing become true, because it grows up in its own nature, and so if bad when small, is worse when great. If the duplicity of this faith lyes only in degree of growth (as your Parenthesis implies) then it is false to affirm, that it is not accompanied with the Salvation of God. But it is manifest by what you say in the next page, that you mean a true faith not accompanied with Salvation: For undertaking (with as much confidence as little knowledge) to evince against all Opposers the truth of what you have asserted, you say That there is a faith, which without further growth, is not accompanied with the Salvation of God, is evident from the words of Paul, Rom. 13. 11. For now is our Salvation nearer than when we believed: which, say you, clearly shews, that the Scripture informs us of a belief or faith attained by such as were not arrived unto (nor yet Witnesses of) the Salvation of God: They were only come nearer unto it, than when they first believed, but not come at it, you say. And, you add, no doubt but this belief or faith spoken of by the Apostle was a faith on Christ, and you quote John 6. 29. This is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. From all which it is most plain that the Faith you say is not accompanied*

with Gods Salvation, is a true Faith, a Faith on Christ; & Faith wrought by God. Now that you have grossly erred in asserting that such a Faith is not accompanied with the Salvation of God, I shall endeavour to make you sensible. The Text you bring to prove your Assertion, does not at all prove what you bring it for: For *Paul* there speaks of the compleat and perfect state of Salvation, the finishing of the work; which as they grew in Faith, they grew nearer and nearer to. But that does not prove that they had not then attained to any degree or measure of Salvation at all: For *Salvation* is to be wrought out, as the Apostle tells us, *Phil. 2. 12.* and this work is not the work of a *Moment*, not done (as you say) in the twinkling of an Eye, but is carried on gradually; and no man sure will say (if he consider what he says) that a work is not begun, because it is not finished. The true Faith gives victory over the World; and so far as any man through Faith has obtained victory, so far is he a witness of the Salvation of God. It is the nature of the true Faith to overcome; and where it is least, though but as a grain of Mustard Seed; yet if that grain, that small measure, Remove but one mountain of sin out of the Heart, (which it is able to do, *Mat. 17. 20.*) so far is that Faith accompanied with the Salvation of God: This in the general. Now as to the state of that particular Church or gathered people, to whom the Apostle writ that Epistle; and who you say were not arrived unto, nor yet Witnesses of the Salvation of God, who (you say) were only come nearer unto it, but not come at it; It appears they were beloved of God, and called Saints, *Rom. 1. 7.* And so according to your own Observation, pag. 61. (where you say, the called of God are justified) they were justified. And not only so, but such was their Faith, that it was spoken of throughout the World, *verse 8.* (what made this Faith of theirs so Famous think you, if it was not accompanied with the Salvation of God?) Nay the Apostle tells them he longed to see them, that he might be comforted together with them, by the mutual Faith both of them and him, *verse 12.* So that it seems their Faith was one and the same with his, and accordingly in the place you stumble at and fall upon, *Rom. 13. 11.* He joyns himself and them together, Now (says he) is OUR Salvation nearer, then when WE believed; And will you say that neither they nor he were arrived unto, nor Witnesses of, the Salvation of God; that they were only come

come nearer to it, than when they first believed, but not come at it? Truly *the Apostle is little beholden to you.* Doth he not tell them, *Rom. 4. 1.* That *being justified by Faith, both he and they had peace with God?* And will you now tell us, (and undertake to evince it also against all Opposers,) that they were not arrived unto the Salvation of God; that they were not witnesses of it, *were only come nearer to it, but not come at it?* What! at no part of it? No measure of Salvation witnessed by them? Were they justified by Faith, and yet not saved by Faith in any degree? Had they peace with God in an unsaved State? Were they justified by Faith, and yet that Faith not accompanied with the Salvation of God? What confusion have you run into!

You speak in page 65. of the other Faith, which you call a Faith in the Blood of Christ for remission of sins; and this Faith, you say, is unto Salvation; and wheresoever it is manifested it is accompanied (you say) with the fruits of the Spirit, and Evangelical Obedience. Consider now I pray, had not the Church of Christ to which the Apostle writ, nor the Apostle himself, who writ to them, this Faith? Was not the Faith of Paul and the Believing Romans; unto whom he writ, a Faith in the Blood of Christ for remission of sins? How else came they to be made free from sin, *Rom. 6. 18.* And was not the Faith of the believing Romans accompanied with the Fruits of the Spirit, which being made free from sin, they had their Fruit unto Holiness, *Rom. 6. 22.* And was not their Faith accompanied with Evangelical Obedience, when having obeyed, and from the heart too, that form of Doctrine which was delivered to them, *Rom. 6. 17.* Their Obedience was come abroad unto all men, *Rom. 16. 26.* Now since you say Obedience unto Christ, was a qualification accompanying such as were made partakers of the Salvation of God; since you say the Fruits of the Spirit and Evangelical Obedience are inseparable from that Faith that is unto Salvation; you must either charge the then Church of Christ at Rome, that they had not the Fruits of the Spirit and Evangelical Obedience (in direct opposition to the Spirit, which in that Epistle plainly says they had), or you must acknowledge they were in that Faith which is in the Blood of Christ for remission of sins. In that Faith that is unto Salvation; and that they were made partakers of the Salva-

tion of God, though you have but just before said, They were not arrived unto (not yet Witnesses of) the Salvation of God; they were only come nearer to it, than when they first believed, but not come at it. And could you have studied a more *gross contradiction*! But you may see by this what it is to put your meanings and meer *private Interpretations* upon the Scriptures of Truth, whereby you have at once been led into self contradiction, horrible Confusion, and false Doctrine.

In pag. 70. You say, *'Tis needful now to sum up the whole matter; and in order thereunto, you say, This Discourse (of yours) touching Justification and Salvation, may be reduced to this; First, That some professing Christianity, are at least doubtful, that others under the like profession pretend to a state of Justification and Salvation, through the imputation of Christs Righteousness, whilst they are continuing in their sins, &c. Secondly, That some others under the SAME profession of Christianity, are jealous, That the Principles which some hold forth, have a tendency to introduce a Righteousness of our own, as meritorious to eternal Salvation.* Here you make a strange Jumble between *some doubting, and others being jealous*, expressing your selves so darkly, as if you had no mind to be understood. These *some* that you say are so *doubtful* of others, must doubtless be *your selves*, and those *others* must be the Professors, or Profane, or both, since no others pretend to what you are doubtful of. And the *others* you speak of in pag. 71. who it seems are as jealous of you, as you are doubtful of them, must also, by the character you give them, be some of the Worlds People. Yet these it seems are under the *LIKE*, Yea the *SAME PROFESSION* as you are. But their Profession you know is *not the true* Profession of Christianity. Judge then what you have rendred your own to be: Have you not sum'd up the whole matter fairly, and reduced your discourse to a fine Issue, who have rambled so far in words touching *Justification*, that at length you have brought *Condemnation* upon your selves and your Profession, by rendring your Profession not only *like*, but the *same* with theirs whom you condemn.

I have now passed through so much of your second Part as pretends to treat of Doctrines, making some Observations on particular Passages, as I went. And now, I think, it will not be amiss to make one general Observation on this part of your

your Work. There is little agreement between the Title of your Second Part, and the Part it self, as if one had no Relation to the other: For in your Title Page you say, *Doctrines of Truth (clear'd from Objections) are laid down, agreeable to the Scriptures of Truth; given forth by Inspiration, and according as they have been received and owned by the Children of Light, or such amongst the People termed in derision Quakers, who have received from God Divine Understanding, and kept their place and Habitation in the unchangeable Truth.* But I am well assured the Children of Light will see, that instead of *clearing* the Doctrines of Truth from Objections, you have *clog'd* them with Objections; instead of laying down Doctrines, agreeable to the Scriptures of Truth given forth by Inspiration, you have laid down what has been agreeable to your own *vain Imaginations*, and perverted the Scriptures of Truth, to make them countenance your Conceits. Instead of laying down Doctrines according as they have been received and owned by the Children of Light, you have laid them down *directly contrary* to the Ancient Testimony which hath been received, owned and kept by the Children of Light, who while they keep their place and habitation in the unchangeable Truth, and retain that Divine understanding which they have received from God, can never receive your *dark meanings* and *private interpretations*, but reject them as the fruits of darkness.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Sett. 1. **T**O your 2. part you joyn an Appendix pag 72. containing you say the substance of an Answer, given by some you call Friends of Bristol to the Paper given forth by 66 persons from Ellis Hookes's Chamber in London the 12th. of 4th. month 1677. Had you intended fairly you should have published that paper also, to which this you do publish is called an Answer. But you are so far from that, that you do not begin with the beginning of the Paper, and so proceed in an orderly Method of answering; but creeping in toward the middle of it, you single out some words, and thereupon declare you do not own the *aforsaid* judgment to be righteous. Whether you do or not, is not much material: it is enough that the Lord owns it, and his People own it. You set it down in these words, viz. "We do hereby reprove and judge, that zealous, tending and separating Spirit, and them (meaning John Story and John Wilkinson) and their Separate Company, as being in that Spirit of separation, and that by the power and Spirit of our God: And we warn all to whom this comes, to beware of the said John Story and John Wilkinson, whose way at present is not the way of peace, &c. Now had you your selves been righteous, or minded to deal righteously, you would have taken the whole matter together, and not as you have done, leave out both what went before and what followed after. What went before shewed the Inducements to give this Judgment; what followed after was a proof that their way is not the way of peace and Christian Concord. But concealing that, you declare, *That the Spirit of God did not move in the hearts of the 66 Subscribers to give forth the same; and that this is so*, say you, *we thus manifest*. First, you say, page 73. *The great Crime against John Story and John Wilkinson is, for that (as Report saith) they have been Instrumental to set up, or at least encourage a separate Men's Meeting in the North, wherein the outward affairs of the Church are managed, and so consequently is esteemed, besides that form of government which is contended for.* The government contended for is the government of Christ, and the

the form thereof, is of his appointing, And that separate Meeting being set up in Opposition thereto, is esteemed (as it is) the work of the wicked one, to divide the members of the body, the Church. And their being Instrumental therein or Incouragers thereof, is one of their Crimes, and a great one too, but not the *only* one. But your grounding this great Crime upon report, is a piece of your policy to render it uncertain and doubtful, though it's well known it depends not on Report, but on Unquestionable and demonstrative Evidence, backt with a Solemn weighty judgment of many honourable Brethren in truth, who had the hearing of the whole matter at the Meeting at Draxwell.

Sett. 2. You say page 73. *It doth not appear to you, from the said paper, that the Meeting from which the aforesaid paper was given forth, was a meeting held according to the form of government contended for: and so you are dissatisfied that the actions of that Meeting are justifiable, by the rule of those that oppose John Story and John Wilkinson on the foot of the separate Meeting so called.* The Rule of those that oppose J. S. and J. W. on the foot of the separate Meeting, is the Spirit and power of God, which J. S. and J. W. have opposed. And by this Rule the Actions of that Meeting at E. H's Chamber, and the paper there given forth, which you quarrel at, are justified; and you in your dissatisfaction, cavilling at that which does not appear to you, condemned. Your Exceptions against that Meeting are weak and childish. First, you would not have it to be the general Meeting because it is not dated from hence; that is, not expressly called the General Meeting in the Paper. A great matter! what though the word [general] was not express? The third paragraph in that Paper relates to the usual Service of the general Meeting, and those words [as on the like Occasion, &c.] make apparent was the general Meeting. 2. You except against it because not held within the time (you say) wherein the general Meeting was appointed to be held. But when I pray did you know the general Meeting limited within a certain time? It is necessary it should have a certain time to begin at, but must it therefore have a certain prefixed time to end in? Are you for the Drick Hour glass? Your third Exception, that several Brethren had left the City before the said Meeting, is no less impertinent and idle. Would you have the Meeting then determined and ended so soon as any of the Bre-

Brethren leave the City. These are empty shifts, which stand you in no stead. Yet after the like manner you trifle in *pag. 74.* to shew that the Meeting that Paper was given forth from, was not the *Men's Meeting of the City of London*, nor the *Second day's Weekly Meeting*. You would fain avoid the force of it, if you could, but you cannot: A Meeting it was, holden in the Power of God, in the Order of Truth, and in the unity of Friends (though you falsely suggest the contrary) and the Testimony that went forth from that Meeting has proved, and is, a burdenstone upon the head of that jealous rending, separating spirit against which it was given; and all you that are joyned to that spirit, partake more or less of its torment, and are dissatisfied, vexed, disquieted, restless, which makes you rage as you do. But what if it had not been the yearly Meeting? or any of those other Meetings you mention? Would that have proved, That the spirit of God did not move in the hearts of the 66 subscribers, to give forth that Paper? That is it you affirm, and which you use this Medium to manifest: but he must needs be Weak himself, that sees not your Weakness therein.

Seit. 3. But you offer a Second Medium, thus. *Secondly* (say you, *pag. 74.*) it appears, that the 66 Subscribers in their Paper, have given forth these Sentences, viz. "At this Meeting the Lord our God hath crowned us with Glory, Dominion and Peace.

"At this time (as on the like occasions hath been frequently with us) the care of the peace and welfare of the Churches of Christ came upon us.

"And are your Servants for his (meaning Christ's) sake.

"By that salt that we have in our selves from the Lord, we are enabled to favour, between the Transformation of the Enemy, and the scruples of the Innocent: And as to be tender of one, so to give judgment against the other.

"And truly, that which hath encouraged us in this Epistle, is that good success God hath blest our like endeavours in his Power with.

"We are unanimously your dear and faithful Brethren, in the labour, travel, tribulation, patience, hope and rejoicing in the Kingdom of Jesus our Lord.

I have

I have transcribed all these six Sentences as you have pickt them brokenly and abruptly out of that Paper, and publisht them in your book. And now what have you to say against them? Why, say you, *On these last six sentences we thus observe, that where they have credit, its but too probable, that it may gain a perswasion, or belief, that the 66 Subscribers are Apostles, and so may become a means to obtain the better Credit to that Paper: should any le thus perswaded, you say, they therein would be mistaken; for you say, three or four from the City of Bristol, who are well known to you; are not exercised in the work of the Ministry, besides others from other Countries and places.* Sure you have very mean apprehensions of Friends, and think them very weak and out of the favour of life, that you reckon a belief, that the 66 Subscribers are Apostles, might make the Paper the more credited. *Is this your way of getting credit to your Papers?* But from your own Observation your Ignorance is observable: for what is therein any of these six Sentences inconsistent with the state of a common member of the Church, though not an Apostle?

1. May none be covered by the Lord God with Glory, dominion and peace, but Apostles?
2. May the care of the peace and welfare of the Churches of Christ, come upon none but Apostles?
- Nay is not every Member of the spiritual body concerned for the peace and welfare thereof, as well as every member of the carnal body is for the safety and welfare thereof?
3. And is there any member of the Church, that ought not (for Christ's sake) to be a servant to his Brethren? Have you so soon forgot what your selves said, 1 Part pag. 15. *We look'd upon our selves all servants one unto another?*
4. Ought not every member to have, salt in himself from the Lord? And may not they that have so, be thereby enabled to savour between the Transformation of the Enemy, and the scruples of the Innocent?
5. May not every Member be encouraged with the good success which God hath blest their like endeavours in his Power with?
6. And may not every member be a dear and faithful brother to his fellow member, and that in the labour, travel, tribulation, Patience, hope and rejoycing in the Kingdom of Jesus, though such members be not Apostles? May none but Apostles come into the labour travel, tribulation, patience, love and rejoycing of the Kingdom of Jesus? How vainly and unacquaintedly with Truth do you in your creaturely or rather sensual Wisdom reason? But

is there any thing in these six sentences to manifest, that the spirit of God did not move in the hearts of the 66 Subscribers to give forth that Paper: for that was it you affirmed, and brought these six sentences to manifest.

Self. 4. You proceed to a Thirdly, pag. 75. Thirdly, say you, we find in the said Paper these two following Sentences, viz. *And for as much as it appears to us, that they will not come to us, nor near us in the peaceable Truth, which we have frequently truly desired for their good, but that they will go on in their Opposition* (Here you skip over these words [and evil smiting against the faithful Brethren, and practice of the Church of Christ] which followed immediatly in the Paper) *refusing to dissolve their separate company in the North.* (There you give over with an &c. But in the paper it follows,) *or clear their hands of them by a faithful Testimony against them; or so much as blot their names out of their Paper of Separation.* This is the first of the two Sentences you carp at, the other is this, viz. *And because we are sensible that they have made an ill use of our forbearance, even to strengthen themselves in their separation, &c.* Your Cavil upon these two Sentences is, in pag. 76. *That if every one of the 66 Subscribers, have not frequently desired John Story and John Wilkinson to come to them, they are then found in a manifest Untruth:* And this, you say, naturally follows; but your natural knowledge often deceives you. Though you are divided and broken, yet blessed be the Lord we are one, and our desires for their good, that they might have come near unto us in the peaceable Truth, were one also. And if this desire was in every one of the 66 Subscribers (which you have no cause to doubt) though every one of them should not have had opportunity to express that desire to J. S. and J. W. then can you not manifest that they are found in an Untruth. But truth is their Covering and defence against your slanderous Tongues, who vain would break the Bond of Unity, and divide the Brethren who are one, but you cannot. For what was express'd by any of them to J. S. and J. W. in relation to their coming near us in the peaceable Truth, the same (no doubt) was desired by all, and that for their good. Besides, you seem to understand those words [They will not come at us, nor near us in the peaceable Truth] to be meant of a personal coming to us; but that is your mistake:

mistake: for those words have a relation to the words foregoing viz. *That they might return and be reconciled*; which is a coming at us, and near us in the peaceable Truth. For without this returning and being reconciled, they might have come to us in *Person*, but out of the peaceable Truth, and in a distance of *Spirit*, which was not the coming desired. But their coming near us in the peaceable Truth, by a returning and reconciliation, was doubtless truly desired by all that signed that Paper. Of whom, some had before, as opportunity offered, expressed their desire to *J. S. and J. W.* by word of mouth, others by writing, and many by that more publick Admonition and Exhortation subscribed by about 40 Friends, at the time of the yearly Meeting in 1676. which very Paper is refer'd to in that very paragraph out of which you have crop't the latter of these two Sentences you cavil at, and within three lines of it; as it is also particularly mentioned in the 4th Paragraph of that Paper, but two lines before the first of those two Sentences you except against. Nor is your Consequence natural, That if every one of the 66 Subscribers, have not frequently desired *J. S. and J. W.* to come to them, they are then found in a manifest Untruth. For you may find even in the Epistles of the Apostle *Paul*, written in the name of himself and others joyntly, that all things mentioned therein, are not applicable to every of the persons whose names are to the Epistles. For Instance, The first Epistle to the *Thessalonians* was writ by *Paul* and *Silvanus* and *Timothy* joyntly: Yet what is therein mentioned of sufferings at *Philippi*, related not directly either to *Silvanus* or *Timothy*, as appears *Acts* 16. though they write in the name of all three, *After that We had suffered before, and were shamefully entreated at Philippi, We were bold in our God to speak unto you the Gospel of God,* 1 *Thess.* 2. 2. Yet it appears by the Story in the 16. and 17 Chapter of the *Acts* of the Apostles, that neither *Timothy* was in that suffering at *Philippi* (but only *Paul* and *Silas*) nor *Silvanus* at all at *Philippi* that time with *Paul*. Many more Instances might be brought of this nature, if need were, but this is enough to shew the emptiness of your Argument: for might not such a cavilling spirit as yours, after your rate of reasoning have objected, That if every one of those three, in whose names that Epistle to the *Thessalonians* was written,

were not actually in that suffering at *Philippi*, they were then found in a manifest Untruth?

In the same page you affirm, *that neither the 66 Subscribers, nor any other Assembly on Earth, have Power to give judgment in such a case, other than for contempt of Authority, if they had any over them, and not a judgment on the merit of the Cause, though it were on the hearing of one part.* As to *J. S.* and *J. W.* the merit of their cause was judged before at *Drawell*, on a Solemn hearing of both Parts. But you have acted contrary to your own Affirmation: for in the First part of your Book, pag. 62. and 95. You have judged *G. F.* and concluded that he said of his quotation about *Micha's Mother*, *He saw 'twould be a stumbling block.* &c. And yet you had no Evidence of this, nor none could have, for *William Rogers*, speaking of the same thing, in the 5th. Part pag. 34. tells you, *no body was by, or in hearing*, that he knows of. So that here you, who so confidently affirm, no Assembly on Earth hath Power to give judgment on the merit of a Cause, though it were on the hearing of one part, have in the Case of *G. F.* given judgment on the merit of the Cause, without any Evidence, but barely *W. R's* report, who is the Accuser.

Sett. 5. But, you say, *That which to us seems to aggravate the Offence of the 66 Subscribers is this, John Story (being now with us) doth positively affirm, That great part of the Subscribers never spoke or sent to him about the matter for which he is now judged; nor yet to John Wilkinion, as John Story saith, so far as he knows.* It seems you can rely so confidently on the single affirmation of *John Story*, and that not only for himself, but for *John Wilkinion* too, with a so far as he knows, that there upon you dare undertake to judge and condemn the sixty six *without hearing them*; but they may not Judge *J. S.* and *J. W.* though upon the clear Evidence of above 20 faithful Brethren, who had the hearing of both parties face to face at *Drawell*. The same of which Meeting, you acknowledge, pag. 77. hath come to your Ears; and the Narrative of the proceedings there hath, it seems, come to your Eyes too: for you cite a passage out of it. You confess a judgment hath been already passed (at *Drawell* Meeting) by some of the 66 Subscribers (So then some of the 66 Subscribers have had the hearing of both parties face to face.) And you set down a Sentence or two of the Narrative, which you call a Caution in the said Judgment in these words.

And

And now Friends, in God's love, we desire you to suppress all Papers of controversy, relating to this difference, that the minds of Friends be not further troubled and desiled, nor this controversy kept any longer alive. And we do warn all to have a care, that they be not lifted up, by reason of the hurt (you say, but in the narrative it is Temptation and Hurt; What tempted you to leave out Temptation? Were you afraid it would reflect upon your Honourable Brethren, as you often call them, J. S. and J. W?) that's come upon these men, nor yet insult over them; for that Spirit is not of God. This Caution shews the tender care of those of the 66 and other Brethren, who had the hearing of both parties at Drawell, both for the peace and quiet of Friends in general, and for J. S. and J. W. in particular, that none might in suit over them by reason of the Temptation and hurt that is come upon them. But had you designed to deal fairly, ye would have set down the inducement to this tender Caution, which is express in the same Narrative a little above the words ye have quoted, viz. That they did earnestly desire, and were not without some hope, that J. S. and J. W. might give a more compleat satisfaction in time as J. S. said He would, as the Lord should give him a further Understanding, &c. But instead of answering the good expectation that Friends had conceived from that little shew of tenderness and submission that then appeared in them, they quickly hardened themselves in the strivings of love and life in the Brethren for them, renounced the submission or acknowledgement they had made endeavouring by shifts and equivocations to evade and avoid the force of that Paper they had so lately given forth against themselves at Drawell; and have since gone on to a greater degree of separation from and opposition to the Body of Friends, rejecting the Counsel of the Lord unto them through his Servants both privately and publicly, whereby they have not only contracted New, but drawn the weight of their former guilt more heavily upon them, than before.

And whereas you take notice, That it may be said, That John Wilkinson and John Story gave forth a Paper at Drawell, which since they disown; To which you say, This as John Story saith, is wrong; and as evidence thereto, saith to this purpose, that he owns the Paper as given forth; and again, that he still owns the same with that Interpretation he and John Wilkinson gives, &c. If they still own the paper as given forth, they must

must still own it as a Condemnation of themselves, and that with respect to the occasion of offence which they had given to the Church of God in general, for as such it was given forth. The Lord did eminently appear in that Assembly at *Draxwell*, his Power was over them, and the Dread thereof did at that time bow them into some degree of submission, though *Pharaoh*-like having since hardened themselves, they have sought to avoid the stroke of their own Paper by putting by meanings and private Interpretation thereof, contrary to the true intent, and natural plain purport of the Paper. Which as it shews a false, backsliding Spirit in them that would deny its own act to save its head. So *William Rogers* his since calling that Paper of theirs a Rattle, shews a prophane, ungodly treacherous Spirit in him.

Sett. 6. You say pag. 77. 'Tis not in the Power of any two or more Friends in England, to dissolve a Meeting of other Friends, and therefore (you say, it is) great weakness (in the 66 Subscribers, you mean) to assign John Story's and John Wilkinson's refusing to Dissolve a Meeting, as a consideration for so severe a Reproof and Judgment. Here again you deal dishonestly with the 66. for you make as if they had reprov'd and judg'd J. S. and J. W. for not dissolving a Meeting which was not (you say) in their Power to dissolve. This indeed, if it had been true, had been weakness in the 66. But being false, is wickedness in you to suggest it as true. And you are the more to be blamed, because you cannot but know you do the 66. wrong herein: For in that part of their Epistle, out of which you crop't the two Sentences you here treat of, and maim'd them in the recital, they thus write, And for as much as it appeareth to us, that they (J. S. and J. W.) will not come at us, nor near us in the peaceable Truth, which we have frequently truly desired for their good; but that they go on in their Opposition, and evil smiting against the Faithful Brethren and practice of the Church of Christ. (which last Clause, from the word [Opposition] you let drop, and then go on thus) refusing to dissolve their separate Company in the North, (And there, you break off with an &c. shutting out that, which had you let in, would have shut your Cavil out of doors: For it immediately follows in the said Epistle thus) or clear their hands of them by a Faithful Testimony against them; Or so much as blot their Names out of their Paper of Separation. These are the words you
would

would fain have hid with an &c. but they came forth to your shame: For suppose it had not been in the Power of *John Story* and *John Wilkinson* to dissolve that separate Meeting in the North (as some say, *'Tis easier to raise bad Spirits, than to lay them*) Yet will you say, it was not in their Power to have cleared their hands of them, by a Faithful Testimony against them? Or if you think it impossible for *J. S.* and *J. W.* since their giving that Paper at *Drawell*, to bear a Faithful Testimony; (which *W. R.* represents so Faithless and false) yet can you conceive it out of their Power to so much as blot their Names out of their Paper of Separation? You see now it was not *John Story's* and *John Wilkinson's* refusing to that that was not in their Power, that was assigned as a consideration for the reproof and judgment given against them (which you wickedly suggest, in order to charge the 66. with weakness) but it was their refusing to do that which was in their Power? For it was in their Power to attempt the dissolving of their separate Company, whether they could effect it or no; and if they could not effect it, if upon tryal made, they had found it beyond their Power to dissolve them, yet it had not been beyond their Power to have testified against them, much less to have blotted their own Names out of their Paper of Separation. Either of these, to be sure, was in their Power; as it was in your Power also to have dealt more honestly in this Case with the 66. than you have done.

Sett. 7. In pag. 78. You quarrel at the word *Forbearance*, which you say, *seems unbecoming such young men in Truth (if peradventure they are now in the Truth) as well as in years as some of the 66 Subscribers are known to be) to write at the rate they have done, touching such Ancient Brethren Labourers in the Gospel, especially when we consider, how credibly it hath been reported to us, that John Story and John Wilkinson, as to their Doctrine, and Conversation, have been even by some of their Opposers, accounted both sound and blameless.* Your Eye is evil, and your Judgment according: But the Judgment of Truth is otherwise. The *Forbearance* that was exercised towards *J. S.* and *J. W.* was Brotherly and Christian, and sprang from the love of God in the Hearts of the Faithful Brethren. And had *J. S.* and *J. W.* stood in the Ancient Brotherhood, and been true Labourers in the Gospel

Gospel, they had not *sighted* it as they did, which (with their persisting in the work of Division) brought a constraint upon the Spirits of many to appear in reproof and Judgment. And *that* too sprang from the Love of God in the hearts of the Brethren, as the proper way to preserve the simple hearted from being betrayed, and to restore such as were restorable. And therefore it ill becomes you, in *abuse* to the *Forbearance* which the Lord hath exercised his Servants in, to reflect on any of them for their youth; the youngest of whom in the Truth hath no need to beg commendation from Report, how credible soever, though your Ancient *Johns* it seems have. But your Exception is nothing but a Cavil: For Truth is the same in the Young and in the Old, and ought to have its free course. And *Forbearance* being a Christian duty, is applicable to, and ought to be exercised in the wisdom of God, by all the Younger as well as the Elder. Besides, though you have a mind to catch at any thing, and therefore quarrel with some for their Youth; yet you cannot deny but among the 66 there were as many Ancient, Grave, Solid, Weighty Friends as ever you saw to any one Epistle or Testimony in your time. Some who had preach'd Truth and suffered for it, before the oldest of you ever heard it. And what if some *Timothys* were amongst these *Pauls*? Is that such an Offence to you? Had you considered that to some of those Epistles wherein sharp and severe reproof, and judgments are given, Young *Timothys* name is joyned with an ancient *Pauls*, and that the decree of the Church, *Acts 15*. went forth in the name of not only the Apostle and Elders, but the Brethren, to *vers.* 23. you would not perhaps have thought this unseemly.

In the same page you say, *We have not been yet informed by any, that either John Story or John Wilkinson, have been or are found in Opposition to any Order that is settled amongst us in our Mens Meetings.* Here it is hard for the greatest Charity to excuse you from falshood or equivocation: for you acknowledge in the last page that *the same of Drawell Meeting* (wherein a fair and full hearing of both Parties was had) *hath come to your Ears*, and also that *Several accounts have already been given of it.* Now in one of the Accounts given thereof, and attested by above 20 eminent Friends and Labourers in the work of the Gospel (and which you also have seen, for in the last page you recite some part

part of it) it is thus written [*In which Assembly (viz. at Draxwell) the matters in controversy were read, and the Evidences on both Parties called; and upon the whole Examination of their Allegations and Evidences we did find, and therefore declare, both from external Testimonies and our inward sense, that John Story and John Wilkinſon were really faulty in the moſt material things exhibited in Charge againſt them; to wit, that they have been discouragers of and Oppoſers to the preſent Bleſſed Order and Practice of the Church of Chriſt, with reſpect to Monthly and Quarterly Meetings*] and ſo goes on to enumerate ſeveral other particulars. Can any thing be plainer than this, or more expreſs? Now if you were ſo Faithleſs in the Brethren who Subſcribed this Account, and Partial in your ſelves as not to believe it, yet that you ſhould be ſo hardened, as, notwithſtanding this, to ſay, *You have not yet been informed by any, that either John Story or John Wilkinſon have been or are found in Oppoſition to any Order that is ſettled among us in our mens Meeting;* is truly ſad and to be lamented.

Sett. 8. In pag. 79. ſpeaking of the Paper Subſcribed by J. S. J. W. and 85. of their Party, upon which the ſeparate Meeting in the North began, you ſay, *We alſo obſerve, that their hope was to do their own buſineſs in their ſeveral and reſpective Meetings;* this, you ſay, *was not a Reſolve ſo to do, or a ſetting up another Meeting, but an Hope, &c.* And you add, *Yet ſo it is, that to this day, there is no ſuch Meeting, as was then in their Eye or Hope, that we are informed of.* Here you endeavour to clear your Party in the North from having ſet up a ſeparate Meeting. Yet in 1 Part pag. 89. ſpeaking of your Party in *Westmoreland* reſuſing to joyn with Friends in their Monthly and Quarterly Meetings, you ſay, *But yet the perſons ſo reſuſing to joyn with others, as aforeſaid, did (as we have been credibly informed) on convenient times and days, appoint BY THEMSELVES, to meet together, to take care (in that method wherein they found freedom in the Truth) of the ſame Services, &c.* So then by your own acknowledgment, thoſe of your Party in *Westmoreland* did both reſuſe to joyn with Friends in their Monthly and Quarterly Meeting, and appointed to meet together by themſelves. Can any thing be plainer, if you will believe your ſelves, than that they ſet up a ſeparate Meeting?

In pag. 80. You say, *The 66 Subscribers in their Paper, are found accusing John Wilkinson and John Story to this effect: And then you set down several particulars which you have pick'd up here and there in that Paper, and thereupon you tell us how you deal with 4. of the 66 Subscribers that live at Bristol.* In which one may plainly read the subtilty of the Serpent, but nothing of the simplicity of the Dove. It is reputed *Satan's Motto* [*divide and overcome*] and to manifest that you are of a *dividing Spirit*, you would have *divided* (it seems) the 66 too. But Blessed be the Lord, your design is seen, and your end defeated: For the Lord hath united his people by his Spirit, and girded them together by his Power, and they are one in his Life, and in their Testimony therefrom, which will lye as an heavy stone upon the head of that Spirit it went forth against, and upon the heads of all those that are joyned to that Spirit in opposition to the Church of Christ. But in as much as the Friends of Bristol have, in a distinct Reply, wiped off the slanders you have cast both upon them and *Francis Lea*, whom you particularly traduce, I shall not concern my self at present therein.

But your Counsel to the 66 Subscribers I would not over pass. You word it thus, in pag. 83. *And now, say you, our Counsel to the 66 Subscribers is, that they mind the Peace of the Churches of Christ by calling in their Paper; for we are well satisfied, that their Paper is not given forth from the motion of God's Spirit.* So you told us at first, pag. 73. and made as if you would manifest it: but you have been so far from doing that, that you have manifested your own weakness, to say no worse. And would you now have the 66 Subscribers call in their Paper because you are well satisfied? Methinks you should not desire them (all things considered) to lean so much upon you; but give them leave to be well satisfied also. But will you give me leave in the mean time to enquire how you came to be so well satisfied, that their Paper is not given forth from the motion of God's Spirit? Why, *you have discoursed John Story*, as you say your selves, pag. 78. and what *John Story* says (tho in his own case) that you take for granted, and accordingly tell us with great solemnity, that *John Story doth positively affirm, &c.* and as *John Story saith*, over and over, pag. 76, 77, 79. Nay in pag. 88. You declare you take *John Story and John Wilkinson* not

not to be guilty of countenancing Tythe-paying and fleeing in time of persecution, not only for that no proof (as you say) hath appeared to the contrary; but also, say you, *from their frequent Testimonies of their Innocency therein.* So that it may easily be conceived how you came by your satisfaction, and what manner of Satisfaction it is you have. How easily you can satisfy your selves, when you have a mind to acquit one of your own Party! His own word will serve the turn; though the Testimony of a bove 20 Faithful Brethren, that had the hearing of both parties face to face; cannot find credit enough with you, to give you satisfaction.

But after your loud cry against the 66 Subscribers for giving judgment (as you say) *without hearing both Parties* (which in your Book, you frequently call a *Badge of Apostacy*) How do you think to acquit your selves from the *lash of your own rod*, who so peremptorily do give judgment against the 66 both here and in pag. 73. that their Paper is not given forth from the motion of God's Spirit, without hearing the 66 speak for themselves and their Paper? You may now put on your own *Badge*, and see how well it becomes you.

Self. 2. In pag. 85. You mention a Reply given to your Paper, by *Jasper Batt* and three others of the 66 Subscribers, and you think meet; you say, to note *apart thereof*. That's your way indeed, to mangle your Opponent's Answer, and take it by parts. Yet that part you have here taken of *Jasper Batt* and the other Friends Reply, is more than you and all your Party are able to give a reasonable Answer to, and you do but trifle in what you say to it. You note this part, *that the Reader may have a little taste of that Spirit, in which Jasper Batt and his three companions writ their Reply.* But by that taste, which is little indeed to what the Reader might desire, it appears that *Jasper Batt* and his three Companions were in a right Spirit when they writ that. But in your Answer to it, you give a great taste what Spirit you are of: for you say pag. 87. *We cannot say, That fleeing in time of persecution, or countenancing Tythe-Payers, is a putting away Faith, and a good Conscience in all that may so do: For that (you say) may be the Fruit of weakness, and ignorance in some, at which (you say) God may wink; and of unfaithfulness in other some.* It seems then you think Friends

may countenance Tythe-payers with a good Conscience, and may flee in time of Persecution with a good Conscience: (for *Jasper Batt's Query*, to which these words of yours are an Answer, expressly relates to Friends.) But Christ says *Mat. 10. 33. Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in Heaven*; And so the Apostle Paul tells *Timothy*, *If we deny him, he also will deny us*, *2 Tim. 2. 12*. And that he speaks this with respect to Sufferings in time of Persecution, is plain from what he says in the same Verse, *If we suffer, we shall also reign together with him*. Now do you think that Christ will ever deny those that keep Faith and a good Conscience? No sure, those whom he denies are such as put away Faith and a good Conscience. But are not you herein become Countenancers of Tythe-paying, and Incouragers of fleeing in time of Persecution, by telling such, *That if it be the fruit of weakness and ignorance, God may wink at it*? What good end could you have herein? In *pag. 28*. of your first Part, you called Tythes an *Antichristian yoke, which hath spread over Nations in the dark night of Apostacy*; and you say, *You HAVE HAD a Testimony against paying of Tythes*; In *pag. 40*. of your second Part, you say, *The payment of Tythes, at your first Convincement of the Truth, was generally denied, as that which in Truth could not be owned* (It had been well you had kept to that which at first convinced you.) And can Tythes now be paid, or Tythe-payers countenanced with a good Conscience? Can any now put their Necks under that Antichristian yoke, and do that which in Truth cannot be owned, *without putting away Faith and a good Conscience*? You have an idle distinction between weakness and ignorance of the one part, and unfaithfulness of the other; fleeing in time of Persecution, and countenancing Tythe-payers may be the fruit (you say) of *weakness and ignorance in some, and of unfaithfulness in other some*. But is not weakness and ignorance in these Cases, the fruit and effect of unfaithfulness? Do you think any can flee in time of Persecution, or pay Tythes, or countenance others in doing either, and not be unfaithful to God? You have the same distinction in the *5th Section* of your first Part; and there also speaking of Meeting together in time of Persecution, you say, *pag. 28. Whatsoever Society of people had been in the Life of Christianity, and yet should for fear of man, or the Laws of men, forsake*

take the Assembling of themselves together, when the will of the Lord was they should not forbear, &c. As if it ever were the will of the Lord, that his people should forbear Assembling together, to wait upon and Worship him, for fear of man, or the Laws of men. Plainly, your Spirit is not right before the Lord, nor your Reserves agreeable to Truth. You make as if you were against fleeing in time of Persecution, and against Tythe-paying: But still you have a Salvo, [if it be the fruit of weakness and ignorance, God may wink at it.] You make as if you were for keeping up the Testimony of Truth, for keeping up Meetings in the hottest time of Persecution: But yet you have a starting hole, [if the will of the Lord be they should not forbear Meeting.] You plane your piece as smooth as you can; but yet the knots appear. You varnish your matter as fair as you can; but yet in one part or other, the Colour cracks, and discovers the ground not to be good. The Lord more and more discover it to all the simple hearted, and to your selves also.

Self. 10. In pag. 88. You insinuate, That Jasper Batt went abroad Preaching, thereby occasioning sometimes twenty Pound Fines, sometimes 40^l. Fines, to be imposed upon the Hearers; and encouraged them to be Valiant for the Truth, and to offer up all, (whilst his Estate was well secured out of the Persecutors reach, or at least nothing to be found of his own, to pay such Fines. And you say, pag. 89. If the Case stated in Jasper Batt's Name, be not groundless, 'tis then notoriously wicked; but of that, say you, Friends in Somersetshire are able to speak more certainly, than we; for we are not willing to Accuse on Report. What abominable wickedness is this! To suggest a Scandal against a man, and publish it to the Nation on purpose to defame him, and then say, IF it be not groundless, it is notoriously wicked. But how notoriously wicked are you, if it be groundless! However, whether it be groundless or not groundless in it self, it is evident that it is groundless as to you, for you confess you are not certain of it, but have taken it upon Report. And yet you say, You are not willing to Accuse upon Report. But you are willing to Slander upon Report, which is the worst way of Accusing; And so hardened you are in this Course, as if it were fallen judicially upon you. You say pag. 89. We now are sensible that the

said

said Jasper Batt, and his three Companions (having assumed the place of Judges,) will not think our Argument deducible from the Light within (O shameless men! Do you call your Slandrous Insinuation an Argument deducible from the Light within!) sufficient to evidence their Ignorance and weakness; no more, than if they were four blind Priests, who neglecting the Heavenly Gift in themselves, may seek a Justification of their Priestly Jurisdiction, from the Scriptures without. No more than if they were four blind Priests! This needs no Comment sure: Every Friend that reads this, will say our what Spirit you were in when you writ it. But hereupon you say, *You think it needful to observe somewhat from the Scriptures of Truth, in relation to the matter in hand, which you make to be judging without hearing.* Yet in that you are false too; for John Story and John Wilkinson were not judged before they were heard; they were heard before they were judged; and that you very well know: For you quote a Passage, pag. 77. out of the Narrative which gives an Account of their Hearing. Yet hereupon you run on and fall into your former mistake of the meaning of Christs words, *Joh. 5. 30. As I hear, I judge,* which you make to be the hearing of the outward Ear. But therein you Err, as I have shewed before. You add the words of Christ, *Mat. 7. 1. Judge not, that you be not judged.* And this Scripture you alledge indefinitely, and without explication, as if you would have it taken that Christ forbid all and all manner of judging in general, good as well as bad, true as well as false, right as well as wrong, all at once together: For you make no distinction. To what end think you then did Christ ordain, (*Mat. 18.*) that Offenders should be complained off to the Church, if the Church had no power nor liberty to judge? Paul did not understand it so, when he said to the Corinthians, *1 Cor. 5. 12. What have I to do to judge them that are without? Do not you judge them that are within.* Verse 13. *But God judgeth them that are without. Put away therefore from among yourselves that wicked man.*

Sett. 11. Here again you fall into your old Trade of insinuating slanders by way of Objection. But perhaps, say you, Jasper Batt may tell us, *That we are unlearned and do wrest the Scriptures; and that Christ and his Apostles did not mean, but that such men as he, might judge such men as John Story and John Wilkinson*

Wilkinson without an hearing; and perhaps as a reason may thus say; Though the Lord was pleased to send them forth, commissioning them to publish the Gospel of Christ and that in that service they have been made Instruments to gather many into the knowledge, and life of Christianity, yet they are not now Subject to Geo. Fox's Orders, and what he hath given forth in the motion of the Spirit of God. And you add, If this Objection contains the sense of Jasper Batt, &c. Did you learn this black Art of Hicks the Baptist? What baser and more unworthy way can be used to slander and abuse men, than this of suggesting scandals, by a [perhaps] and pursuing them with an [If?] Were not your Cause the worst of Causes, you would not take the worst of courses to carry it on.

But you seem page 91. to please your selves with a conceit of some considerable advantage against Jasper Batt, if you could prove him disobedient to what G. F. hath given forth; and thereupon you transcribe part of a Paper given forth by G. F. which you say is on this wise, Friends, To you all this is the Word of the Lord; take heed of judging one another, and judge not one another, &c. But what is this to Jasper Batt's and the rest of the 66 their Judging J. S. and J. W? This is a warning to Friends, not to Judge one another: but it is not a warning to Friends nor to Judge those that are gone into a Separation from Friends and Opposition to Friends. Though that Paper says to Friends who are in Unity in the Truth Judge not one another, yet it does not say Judge not them that being gone out of the Unity themselves, are labouring and endeavouring to draw others out also, and to divide and rend the Church. So that you have mist your aim, and lost your Blow: for the Judgment given by Jasper Batt and the rest of the 66 Subscribers, carries nothing of contradiction in it to this Paper given forth by G. F. But remains as a burdensome stone on the head of the Serpent, which makes him twist and twine his tail about as he does.

CHAP. VI.

Seit. 1. **T**hus I am come to the end of your Second part, and now intend with the Lord's assistance, to make some Observations on your Third Part also, which seems chiefly designed to treat of the Government of Christ, which in pag. 3. You say, *You do not believe to be represented by visible Persons, certainly known by outward names, distinguished by outward marks and tokens, and invested with Power from him to execute outward laws, in an outward form of Government, visible by our carnal Eyes, as aforesaid.* Much to the same purpose you speak also in your Title pag. to this part, laying, that whereas here you say, *you do not believe, &c.* There you positively affirm that *Christ's Government is not represented by visible Persons, &c.* This your Negative Definition of the government of Christ is very dark, obscure and uncertain: for though you have been (it may be over) curious in characterizing persons, by their visibility, being certainly known by outward names, distinguish'd by outward marks and tokens, and invested with Power from him to execute outward Laws, in an outward form of Government, visible by your Carnal eyes, and with an [As aforesaid] too: yet what you mean by the Government's not being represented by these, is not easy to be conceived. Do you mean, that Christ hath not *divested* himself of the Government of his Church (because among other characters of the persons you describe, you speak of their being *invested* with Power from Christ to execute outward laws) that he hath not transferred it upon, and *wholly consigned* it unto men? Or do you mean, that the government of the Church is so upon Christ as that he *may not, or will not,* make use of any *external Instruments*, to discover his mind and will unto his Church by, with respect to the Government and Discipline of it, as well as with respect to Doctrine (for that I suppose you admit :) If by the Government of Christ being not represented by persons, you mean the *first* of these, I suppose you will find no Opponent; at least (I assure you) you shall find none of me. But if you intend

tend the *Latter*; you must pardon me if you find me of a contrary perswasion until I meet with more clear demonstration than any thing in your Book looks like. Now if you grant that Christ (upon whom the Government is laid, and to whom alone it belongs) may make use of *outward Instruments*, to discover his mind and will unto his Church, with respect to the Discipline and Government thereof, then is your quarrel wholly groundless, and all your Cry without Cause. And if on the other hand you should deny this, you would thereby discover very great ignorance of the nature of Christs Government. For the Government of Christ hath a twofold relation, to Particulars, and to the General, to every *individual* Member, and to the *whole* Body. The Government of Christ over particular and individual Members, may be (and for the most part is) executed by the *immediate* inspeaking of the word of Life and Power in their own hearts; and yet, even in this case, not wholly absolutely and utterly exclusive of instrumental means sometimes, and on some occasions, for giving Counsel, Exhortation, Admonition, Direction and Reproof too, from the same word of Life and Power speaking in and through others, with respect to their particular Government. Examples of this kind are plentiful in the Scriptures (as in *1 Tim.* 3. 15. and 4. 13. to the end, and 6. 11, 20. in *2 Tim.* 1. 6, 13, 14. and 2. 22, 23. and 3. 14. and 4. 5. in *Titus* 2. 7. and in *Col.* 4. 17.) But the Government of Christ in and over the *whole* Body his Church, with respect to the Order and Discipline thereof, although it stands in and results from the immediate vertue and power of the same word of life, yet it is usually (at least) dispensed through some Instrument or Instruments, which he is pleased to make use of. I know I touch a tender point, and in a Ticklish time, wherein many minds are possest with Jealousies, and filled with Surmisings, as strange as groundless. That therefore I may not be misunderstood by any, I add by way of Explanation of what I have already said, thus. That although Christ in his governing of *particular* Members, doth usually and for the most part (though not always) impart his mind and will unto them, with respect to the well-ordering, behaving and governing themselves as *particular* Members, *immediately by his Spirit* in their own Hearts, without the use of any outward Instrument: Yet in the Government of the *Body*, the Church,

he doth usually (at least) communicate his mind and will to the Church, with respect to the Order, Discipline and Government thereof as a Church, by and through such Instruments who are Members of the Church, as he is pleased from time to time to speak through. Thus was it in the Primitive Christian Church, as the Epistles of the Apostles abundantly witness, which are full of Advice, Counsel, Exhortation, Instruction, Direction to the Churches how to order, manage and govern the Affairs of the Churches. And thus was it particularly in the case of choosing *Deacons*, *Acts 6.* where it is evident that our Lord did communicate his pleasure, for the management of that part of the Churches Affairs, to the multitude of the Disciples, not by an immediate motion in every one of them particularly and distinctly, but by the *twelve Apostles*, *ver. 12.* Nor is this way of Christs communicating his mind through some particular Members to the Church, with respect to the Order and Discipline thereof, any derogation from or diminution of the Power and Authority of Christs Government, since the Government of the Church rests and remains nevertheless upon *Christs Shoulders*, while those Members by whom he communicates his mind to the rest, are but as Vessels or Instruments through which he speaks to the Body. And if any have thought this unnecessary or needless, in this day of the manifestation of the Spirit unto every one: Let such consider, 1. The difference between Particulars and Generals, between a single Member and a Body composed of a multitude of Members. 2. Why it should seem more strange in this, than in the Case of Preaching, wherein, although it be agreed on all hands (among us) that the measure of Grace, or manifestation of the Spirit, given to every one, is a sufficient Teacher, yet is it acknowledged on all hands also, that Christ, the great Teacher of his people, hath raised up, commissioned and sent forth many, not only to Preach the Gospel to the World, and thereby gather people out of the World to himself; but also to teach (*1 Cor. 4. 17. 1 Tim. 1. 3. 2 Tim. 2. 2, 24. Rom. 12. 7. Gal. 6. 6.*) to exhort (*1 Thess. 4. 1. 2 Thess. 3. 12. 1 Tim. 6. 2. 2 Tim. 4. 2. Acts 20. 2. Rom. 12. 8.*) to admonish (*1 Thess. 5. 12. 2 Thess. 3. 15.*) to stir up (*2 Pet. 1. 13. and 3. 1.*) to confirm (*Acts 14. 22. and 15. 32, 41.*) to edifie (*1 Cor. 14. 3, 4. 2 Cor. 12. 8. and 13. 10.*) to comfort (*1 Cor. 14. 3, and 2. 1, 4. Ephes. 6. 22. 1 Thess.*

1 Thess.

1 *Thess.* 2. 11. and 3. 2. *Acts* 16. 40.) those that are already gathered out of the World, and brought to a belief in and obedience to the Truth. That thus it was in former times, the Scriptures cited prove; and that thus it is at this day our own experience shews: Yet no man, of true Spiritual Sense, rejects the works of the Ministry, or denies it to be the Ministry of Christ, because instrumentally dispensed by man. Why then should any man (pretending Spiritual Sense) oppose the Government of the Church, and deny it to be the Government of Christ, because the mind of Christ, in relation thereunto, was or is instrumentally communicated to the Church by man? 3. Let such also consider, that it is the pleasure of Christ thus to carry on the Government of his Church. And therefore (as we read, *1 Cor.* 12. 28.) amongst the manifold gifts, which Christ hath bestowed upon his Church, for the building up thereof both in Doctrine and Discipline, he hath ordained in his Church, *Helps, Governments,* or (as some Translations read it) *Helps in Government,* by which are denoted those whom he is pleased to make use of as Instruments, to signify his pleasure to the Church by. These in Scripture are said to have the Rule over the flock, *Heb.* 13. 8. 17, 24. *1 Tim.* 5. 17. Nor that strictly and properly they rule, but Christ. So that as in another Case Christ relecth his Disciples, *It is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you,* *Mat.* 10. 20. And as Paul said of himself, *Gal.* 2. 20. *Nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me;* So may it be said of those whom God hath made use of as Instruments in his hand to be Helps in the Government of his Church; they Rule, yet not they, but Christ ruleth in by and through them, whom the Holy Ghost hath made Overseers of the flock, as in *Acts* 20. 28. Upon whom (as upon Paul, *2 Cor.* 11. 28.) the care of the Churches are (*2 Cor.* 7. 18. and 8. 16.) For to take care of the Church of God is part, and a great part too, of the Office which Paul testifies, he that seeketh, seeketh a good work, *1 Tim.* 3. 1, 5. So that although the Government of Christ be an inward Government (at least, as it is opposed to the Civil, Political and Temporal Governments in the world) yet they whom he is pleased to use as Helps in Government, are visible persons, Men. When he ascended up on high, he gave Gifts unto men, *Ephes.* 4. 8. Some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors, some Teachers, ver. 11. And these Apostles; Prophets,

Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers, were visible persons, certainly known by outward Names, distinguished by outward marks and tokens, and invested with Power, from him. Nor does the Scripture you bring to prove Christ's Government an Inward Government, say the contrary, viz. Jer. 31. 31, 32, 33. Where the Lord promising to make a New Covenant with his people, sayeth; *I will put my Law in their inward Parts, and write it in their Hearts, &c. And they shall teach no more every man his Neighbour, &c. Saying, know the Lord: For they shall all know me from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith the Lord.* Now as this does not exclude the use of outward Instruments in Teaching, so neither doth it exclude the use of Outward Instruments in governing, or in manifesting the mind and will of Christ to his Church with respect to Government and Order. Had these things been well considered and duly weighed by you, there would have been no place found for your Cavils about Church-Government.

Self. 2. In page 5. You say There are divers true marks, whereby the Opposers of Christ's Government may be distinguished; And having set down half a dozen of them, you say in page 6. You are really persuaded, from what your eyes and ears have been Witnesses, that many of those amongst the People called Quakers, who have Zealously contended for the Observation of outward Rules and Orders, given forth by one man, bear all the aforesaid Marks. To which I say, 1. That Christ's Government over his Church doth not exclude Outward Rules and Orders. 2. That those outward Rules and Orders at this day received and practised in the Church of Christ are of his appointing. Doth not John Wilkinson acknowledge that the Lord is in them, 4th part pag. 77. Where in his Letter to G. F. he says, *It may be feared many do Eye more the Orders from thee, than they eye the Lord in them.* And therefore, 3. They ought to be observed, and the Observation of them zealously contended for in the light and life of Jesus, by those who see the Service of them, and feel the leadings of the Spirit of Truth into them, against those dark Spirits, who envying the prosperity and peace, which these things (as ordained by Christ and brought forth and practised in his life) have a tendency to preserve, rush on in a heady blind Will, to gain say and oppose they know not what. 4. That these out-ward

ward. Rules and Orders being given forth, as you say, by one man, ought no way to lessen the authority or value of them, since it is not man nor men that is to be looked at in these cases, but the Power of God, which imprints as great authority on what it brings forth through one man as through many. And that's the true reason, why those things which have been given forth through one man, being felt in the life to proceed from the Spirit of God, have been so generally received and owned, when as those Rules, Orders or Prescriptions given forth by the Separate party not having the favour of life or authority of truth in them, but proceeding from a dark, wrong, dividing Spirit working in the earthly subtilly, were rejected, although subscribed by 87 of you. But now to take a little particular notice of the marks you give of the Opposers of Christ's Government:

1. You say, *They are such as are in a voluntary humility.* But are not some of your Separate Party such? And do not you represent J. W. in the comparison you make between him and G. F. (4th part pag. 63, 64.) as if he were such an One? 2. You say, *They are such as worship Angels, which may reasonably (you say) be taken to be a worshipping of some Messengers whom God hath sent.* But are not you worshippers (in the sense you speak) of John Story and John Wilkinson, whom William Rogers extolls so highly, in his Preface, pag. 3. that he says *their Conversation and Doctrine he hath not known or understood to be exceeded in Godliness, by any mortal man whatsoever?* And another of your Party, hath in a public Meeting expressly called John Story an Angel. 3. You say, *They are such as intrude into those things they have not seen.* But to whom can this so properly belong as to those of your Party who take upon them to judge, condemn, oppose and contradict the Practice of Friends, and yet confess they want sight, they have not clearness of sight, they do not see, &c. 4. You say, *They are such as are puffed up in their fleshly minds.* But are any so likely to be puffed up in a fleshly mind, as you that are feeding on and pleading for the creaturely knowledge, Wisdom and understanding? contending that the Tree of knowledge is good for food, though the Apostle tells you *knowledge puffs up?* 5. You say, *They are such as give not all obedience unto the head Christ,* to be sure, You that reject, despise, slight and vilify that Order and discipline which Christ, who is the Head of the Church, hath established in the Church,

are

are far from giving *all* obedience (if you give any) unto the Head Christ. And lastly you say, *They are such as are subject to Ordinances after the Commandments and Doctrines of men.* Such are your separate Company who propose subjection to Ordinances after the Commandments of men, as appears by their Paper of separation subscribed by 87. wherein it is propounded that none should act or meddle, but such as receive power from them; and they that do otherwise are reputed by them Usurpers of authority. Thus it appears that you and your Party bear all these marks, whereby you say the Opposers of Christ's Government may be distinguished; so that you have sufficiently distinguished your selves.

Sett. 3. In pag. 10. You frame an Objection after your manner full of confusion, falshood and contradiction. You make the Objectors say, *We understand that many called Quakers, do hold monthly and quarterly Meetings of men, and also of women distinct from men, about their Church affairs; and that these Meetings are reputed to be established (on certain days that ought not to be altered) by one man amongst them, that hath pretended he was moved of God so to do.* Herein you utter falshood upon falshood, Untruth upon Untruth. First it is a plain *falshood* to say, Our monthly and quarterly Meetings are reputed to be established by any man or men. We say they were established by the Power of God. If you do not believe so, why do any of you come to them? If you do believe so, why do you gain-say your own belief? But in this you are guilty not only of untruth, but self contradiction too: for though you say here, *These Meetings are reputed to be established by one man;* yet but a few lines lower, in the same Objection, you say, *Some call these Meetings the Government of Christ set up amongst them, and established by the Power of God, to take care of the Churches affairs.* You want a Memory suitable to your undertaking. 2. 'Tis another *falshood* to say, *These Meetings are reputed to be established on certain days, that ought not to be altered.* We do not repute them so established on certain days, as that they ought nor upon any occasion to be altered: for we know they may be and sometimes have been altered both as to time and place, when the service of truth and conveniency of Friends has called for it. What you say therefore of certain days being so appointed, *as that if any of*
that

that Society assent not thereto, or endeavour to alter them to another day, when such may be justly censured as men of loose Spirits, or led by a corrupt Spirit of darkness, in this case groundless: For the days, on which those Meetings were at first appointed to be held, were assented to by the Societies, and chosen with respect to the service of truth, and conveniency of those Societies. Nor do Friends stick to those days, but that they do alter them upon the same consideration of greater Service to truth, and more conveniency to the Society; as some of you (or of Party with you) cannot but by experience know. But yet to alter our Meeting days, upon the evil surmises of some mischievous minds, pretending a fear of corruption in observing a day, we see no cause; especially when the design is plainly seen to be to destroy those Meetings, by reducing them first to uncertainty and then to nothing. And if some, who have thus endeavoured to undermine and destroy these Meetings have been censured as men of loose Spirits, or led by a corrupt Spirit of darkness, it hath not, I believe, been without cause. Nor do I think it hard to demonstrate that in some places, where such have had the greatest sway, more than Ordinary looseness and corruption hath broke forth.

You speak of idolizing Meeting days, pag. 13. But it was an evil surmise and distrust in you of Friends, that made you fear (if you really did fear) such a thing. And therefore seeing it is confessed, pag. 19. and that from an abundant Satisfaction too, at least as is pretended, that set and appointed Meetings, on certain prefix'd days, being with the joynt concurrence of those Members assembling, and from time to time to be assembled, are not inconsistent with that form that the Power of God may lead into? and since those days for Meetings were at first set, appointed and prefixt by such joynt concurrence: They were not Friends in Truth that (in pag. 13. you say) moved, nor did they move in Truth, to alter the days of Meeting (on that pretence) thereby raising Contention, and kindling a Fire about Church-Government, as they have done. For it is evident even from your own Confession here, that the contention that hath arisen, the fire that hath been kindled, arose from and was kindled by that motion, which you say was made by some for altering the Meeting days, which there was no just cause to alter. And therefore it behoves those, who made that motion, to cease their contention,

tention, and rather endeavour to *extinguish the flame*, than scatter as they have done their *Fire-brands* about : For an heavy account will be required of them for *raising this contention* and *kindling this fire* about Church-Government. Besides, though your motion was *evil*, yet if you had only moved it, and not endcavoured to carry it on with an *high hand*, it is not probable such a contention could have arisen : For if upon others not assenting to your motion, ye had been *quiet* and *still*, there could have been no *ground* for such a *contention*, nor *fuel* for such a *fire* as you have kindled. And as those Faithful Friends, who refused to assent to your motion, had no reason to assent on the ground you propole ; so 'tis very probable they might even then have some sense, and fore-sight of the nature and design of that Spirit, from which your motion sprang, and there-upon could not assent thereto. For though your motion was then coloured with a specious but groundless pretence of Zeal against Idolizing days, yet the fruit that Spirit hath since brought forth hath discovered the design thereof to be to undermine and to lay wast those Meetings, by reducing them to an *uncertainty* of time, to be held only *as occasion offers*, as you intimate, First Part, pag. 38, 58. and 80. However it is evident here even from your own acknowledgment, that the *Contention* that hath arisen, and the *fire* that hath been kindled, did arise and spring from a motion made by *you*, or *those of Party with you*. You made the breach, you (I mean your Party) began the difference. You would not be quiet, and let Friends go on in their Orderly Service for the Truth, but you would turn things Top-sy-Turvy, you would alter Meetings at your pleasure. And because Friends could not close with your design, nor bow to your imperious usurping Spirit, you raised Contention, you turn'd *Incendiaries*, you kindled the Fire and *blowed up the Coals* of Dissention about Church-Government ! So that you need not have sought so many occasions to ground the difference on, as you have done in the Preface and first Part : For you here plainly manifest that you your selves gave the first occasion, rise and ground for it. You began it, you were the Authors of it, from you it took its Original, and at your door doth all the mischief lye, that hath been occasioned by it.

Sett. 4. I now enter upon that part of your Treatise, which *William Rogers* writ some years ago as a kind of Answer to a Book of *Robert Barclay's* (Entituled, *The Anarchy of the Ranters refuted, &c.*) and which in the Title-page of this third Part you have Entituled your selves to. However since this part of your Book is pretended to be written by *W. R.* only, I shall apply my self, in my Observations thereon, more particularly to him. First then I observe, *William*, that thou entrest with an Untruth and a slander: For in thy Preface to this Part, thou tellest thy Reader, *pag. 17.* That *the Adversaries to that Antient Truth, whereof the Quakers have been Witnesses, may by that Treatise of R. B. have cause to be jealous, that that people, who have been so great contenders against that Spirit, which would have enforced outward Forms, &c. Should now be more exercised to encourage their Brethren to follow the Orders, &c. of any, — than that never-erring and infallible guide, which hath been so often exalted amongst them, viz. Christs Light in the Conscience.* This is plainly false, The People called *Quakers* do not encourage their Brethren to follow the Orders, Traditions, Examples or Commandments of any, *more than* the Light of Christ in their Consciences: But to follow the Light of Christ in their Consciences, which will lead them to own and receive what comes from the same Light in their Brethren. Nor doth that Book of *R. B.* teach otherwise. So that not thou thy self (than whom Satan has scarce raised up a more mischievous and envious Adversary) hast from that Book any cause for such a jealousy as thou hast here suggested.

Sett. 5. As an Introduction to this part of thy work, thou givest us in *pag. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.* a summary description of the whole, comprised under seven Heads. The most part of which having been already Answered by *Robt Barclay* himself (in that Explanatory Postscript, which in a Christian condescension to the Capacities of the weak, at the request of some Friends, he writ sometime ago, and thou hast now published in Print) I should scarce have thought it needful to take any further notice of it, were it not to manifest thy very disingenuous and unworthy dealing with him, and thy mischievous mind towards Friends and Truth. To begin therefore with thy first Head.

Q

In

In pag. 19. Thou affirmest that, *There ought to be a Government in the Church of Christ, unto which every member of the said Church ought to be subject*: And this thou layst down without any reservation or condition of their seeing it to be their duty or not (as much as thou cryest out against others for requiring (as thou falsely chargest them) obedience without sight.) Now if they ought to be subject, then they are condemnable if they are not subject. As for thy affirming, *That the outward form of this Government doth not appear exactly described in the Scriptures, &c.* It is impertinent, unless the Scriptures had been alledged for an exact description thereof. Thou sayst also, *That at this day nothing can be truly called the exact and perfect Order of this Government, but the Power of God.* I suppose thou meanest not strictly and properly, but in a figurative sense: For since the Order of Christs Government is undoubtedly brought forth by the Power of God, it may rather be called the *product* of the Power, than the Power it self: However the difference being no greater than between the *Cause* and the *Effect*, I will not here contend with thee about it; but taking it at present as thou hast worded it, I shall draw this plain inference therefrom, That if the Power of God be the exact Order of the Government of Christ in his Church, then is the exact Order of the Government of Christ in his Church, manifested in our Monthly, Quarterly and Yearly Meetings (which thou and thy Party oppose) since it is undeniably evident, that the Power of God is present and manifested in those Meetings. Here then, *William*, is the *Dilemma*, which thy own Position hath run thee upon; either to affirm that the Power of God is not manifested in those Meetings (which none but an Heart of Stone and Face of Brass can do) or to acknowledge that *the exact Order of the Government of Christ in his Church* (according to thy own definition thereof) *is manifested in our Monthly, Quarterly and Yearly Meetings*, though thou dost slight and oppose them.

Self. 6. In page 20. and 23. Thou quarrellest with R. B. for saying in the Title Page of his Book, *The antient Apostolick Order of the Church of Christ is re-established amongst the People of God called Quakers, and settled upon its right Basis and foundation.* Against this thou objectest, that *the Quakers are in the practice of many things, with respect to Church discipline, wherein the Scriptures, treating of those things, given forth by Christ and*

his Apostles; are silent; and are not found in the Practice of some other things, which were either practised, exhorted to or commanded by the Apostle, pag. 25. And thou instantest for the One the form of proceedings in Marriages; and for the other, Water Baptism, which thou sayest the Apostles were found in the practice of, but the Quakers forbear pag. 24. But I prithe, William, did the Apostles Practice Water-Baptism as a part of Church-discipline? That's more than ever I heard before; and I think when thou hast well considered it, thou wilt find it a very impertinent Instance. And as to thy other Instance, of the form of proceedings in Marriages, since the Scriptures, as thou sayst, are wholly silent in that case, how knowst thou that the Primitive Christians did not use the same form of proceedings in Marriages, as Friends now use? Thou sayst, I affirm, I affirm often, but thou offerst no proof of what thou affirmest. But be it at present as thou affirmest, that Friends are in the practice of some things, with respect to Church-discipline not mentioned in the Scriptures, and are out of the practice of some other things mentioned there, &c. What then? doth it thence follow that the ancient Apostolick Order of the Church of Christ is not re-established amongst God's People or that it is not settled upon it's right Basis and foundation? That Order which Christ, the Head of the Church, hath brought forth in and for his Church in this day, is the same in nature and ground with what was used in the primitive Church, though in some temporary Circumstances it may somewhat vary; and the foundation of it being the Power and Spirit of God, it is now settled on it's right Basis and foundation, as formerly. And surely since, as thou sayest, pag. 24. *the Principle of Truth in these latter days hath and may further lead into the practice of outward Order in discipline, with relation to the Church of Christ*, it must be great Impiety in any man to reject that Order, which the Principle of truth hath led and doth lead into, as it is no small folly to cavil at its being called the Ancient and Apostolick Order of the Church of Christ.

But thou sayest pag. 24. *The word [Order] with respect to outward Government established by the Church of Christ over it self, I remember not in the Scriptures of Truth.* It is no wonder One that loves Order no better, should not remember the word. Thou mayst read it if thou please in 1 Cor. 11. 34. and 14. 40. and

16. 1. and Col. 2. 5. Where the word is used with respect to Government and discipline, yet not as established by the Church over it self, but by Christ over the Church. . . But what if the word [Order] had not been in the Scriptures? to be sure the thing [Order] was in the primitive Church; and always must be in the Church of him who is the God of Order, and not of confusion.

In the same page thou takest occasion to carp at a passage in R. B's Book, pag. 40. Where he speaks of the Truth and faith we have been and are in the Lord's hand building up. To this thou sayest, *The consideration that Christ is the truth, and the great power of God; and that an establishing in the faith, cannot properly be termed a building up of faith, gives me occasion to treat a little touching the words, establish and build up.* A welcome Occasion no doubt to one whose life lies so much in words but had not the *carping mind* been up, and an *evil Eye* abroad, thou mightest also have considered that although Christ be the truth *essentially*, yet the Doctrines of the Gospel are also in Scripture called the Truth, as in Gal. 2. 5. 14. 2 Tim. 4. 4. and divers other places in which sense it was that R. B. used the word Truth. And therefore thy Cavil is without ground.

Señ. 7. Here again (pag. 25.) thou callest the Order of the Gospel the power of God, and positively sayest, *Nothing else (according to the declared Sense of our antient Friends) can properly be called the Order of the Gospel, but the Power of God: for though (sayst thou) some outward form or appearance may be according to the Order of the Gospel; yet (thou sayst) it can no more properly be called the very Order of the Gospel, than the fruit of a tree can be called the Tree it self.* This is a great mistake, *William*. The power of God is called the Order of the Gospel by a Metonymy of the Cause for the Effect. The Gospel it self is the Power of God (the Apostle calls it expressly so, Rom. 1. 16.) and the Order of the Gospel being that which the Gospel or Power brings forth, is properly the Effect, Product or fruit of the Power; not the Power it self in a strict and proper sense, though in a figurative sense it is sometimes called so. So that according to thy comparison of a Tree and its fruit, The Gospel or power it self is as the Tree, and the Order of the Gospel, which is brought forth in and by the Power, is as the fruit
of

of the Tree. As well therefore mayest thou call the fruit of attre the Tree it self, as call the Order of the Gospel the Gospel it self, or the Power of God which is the Gospel. And though thou seemest to lean upon the declared sense of ancient Friends (both here and in pag. 19.) yet produce if thou canst one Instance, wherein anient Friends have declared it as their sense, that the Order of the Gospel is the Power of God, *properly and strictly understood*; and that nothing can properly be called the Order of the Gospel, but the Power of God. But, *William*, What Order is that which in pag. 24. thou sayst, *The Principle of Truth in these latter days hath lead, and may further lead into the practice of?* Is not that the Order of the Gospel, or the Order which the Gospel the Power of God brings forth? doth the Principle of truth lead into any other Order, with relation to the Church of Christ, than what the Gospel or Power brings forth? And yet the Order which thou there mentionest, thou wilt not (I think) call the Power of God (though it be the product of the Power) because thou callest it an *outward Order in discipline, with relation to the Church of Christ*.

Sett. 8. In pag. 26. Having a little wooded thy understanding about a distinction between the old Covenant and the New, thou sayst, *Here's not the least ground of encouragement for any man under the New Covenant, to pretend that God's Spirit doth or will lead any, to establish Outward Orders, relating to matters of conscience, as the Order of the Gospel*. Why, hast thou forgot they self so soon, *William*? It was but in pag. 24. that thou toldst us, *The Principle of Truth in these latter days hath and may further lead into the practice of outward Order in discipline, with relation to the Church of Christ*. Wilt thou make the Principle of Truth and the Spirit of Christ contrary one to the other?

Thou sayst in the same pag. *Though many may be so weak, as not to know the difference between the two Covenants in some respects; yet there are few of the Lord's People called Quakers but have this undoubted Truth sealed in their hearts, That none of their Outward Practices, under the Exercise of Christ's Government, finds acceptance with the Lord, but as they have an Evidence in their Consciences, that therein they answer the measure of truth in themselves*. FEW, sayest thou! NONE I trow. Didst thou ever know any of the Lords People, but had this undoubted Truth

Scaled

Sealed in their hearts? For my part I know none, nor have so little Charity as to suspect there is any.

Yet hereupon thou quotest *Paul* to the *Colossians*, chap. 2. v. 6, 7. *As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in him, rooted and built up in him, stablished in the Faith.* And (then sayst thou) the very next Verse he saith, *Beware lest any man spoil you through the Tradition of men, according to the Rudiments of the World, and not after Christ.* Upon this Scripture thou thus rovest, If, sayst thou, the following outward Decrees, Precepts, Sentences, decisive Judgments, or Traditions of any sort of the Church, had been in *Paul's* Eye, a real and certain Indication, of being establish'd in the Faith, or rooted in Christ, or that it was the practice of the Church to be establishing Outward indispensable Orders, relating to the Consciences of Believers, I leave it to the Judicious Reader to Savour, whether *Paul* would have so immediately, and as it were in one breath, cautioned them to beware of being spoiled through the Tradition of men, &c. Without a further Caution to take heed, lest they should account the Commands, Sentences, Decrees, or Traditions of the Church such. 'Tis true indeed, that when *Paul* had said to the *Colossians*, *As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in him, rooted and built up in him, stablished in the Faith*, Col. 2. 6, 7. He doth say in the very next Verse, *Beware* (and truly they that have to do with thee, had need beware how they trust any of thy Quotations without Tryal: For he doth not say, as thou hast quoted him, *Beware lest any man spoil you through the Tradition of men*, but *Beware*) lest any man spoil you through Philosophy and vain deceit, after the Tradition of men, &c. Here thou hast deceitfully left out the word *deceit*, that thou mightest the more easily deceive thy Reader. Besides, though this be the very next Verse, yet these are not the very next words: For it follows in the same 7th Verse [*As ye have been taught*] which Sentence thou hast left out fallaciously, for it cuts the Nerves of thy arguing, and plainly shews, that the Saints and Faithful Brethren in Christ at *Coloss*, had not only the pure mind stirred up in them by the Apostles Ministry, but also that they were rooted and built up in Christ, and established in the Faith by the Teaching of the Spirit Instrumentally through the Apostles, as well as immediately in themselves. And also that he did give them a Caution, a plain Caution, to walk in Christ as they had been taught, though

not according to the Tradition of men. So that he distinguishes between the *Teachings* of Gods Spirit *Instrumentally* through his Servants, and the vain *deceitful Tradition* of men, which is without or against the Spirit of God, exhorting them to walk according to the former, as well as warning them to *beware* of the latter. And by joyning the Tradition of men with the Rudiments of the World, and declaring them both to be not after Christ, he sufficiently describes what sort of Tradition he means. Not that to be sure which he and the other Apostles had delivered, which he recommends to the Church at *Thessalonica*, in these words, *Therefore Brethren stand fast, and hold the Traditions which ye have been taught, whether by Word, or our Epistle*, 2 Thess. 2. 15. And again chap. 3. 6. *Now we command you Brethren in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw your selves from every Brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the Tradition which he received of us.* He did not bid them beware lest any man spoil them through these Traditions; but he bids them *hold* these *fast*, and commands them most solemnly, in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to withdraw themselves from every Brother that walked disorderly, and not according therunto. It seems walking according to those Traditions, was then accounted orderly walking. Nor is it reasonable to suppose that *Paul* did reckon the Decrees of the Church among the Traditions of men, when himself was so much concerned therein, as an Instrument among others, not only in drawing up, but in propagating and spreading them about through the Churches, *Acts* 16. 4. But though it be ridiculous to suggest that following outward Decrees, Precepts, &c. was in *Paul's* Eye (or is in the Eye of any of God's People) a real and certain indication of being established in the faith or rooted in Christ, &c. yet it is reasonable to suppose that the rejecting, despising, contemning, slighting, villifying or reproaching the Decrees, Precepts, Sentences, Decisive Judgment, or Traditions given forth and delivered from the Spirit of God, by and through any of the Apostles or Ministers of Christ in that day, would have been in *Paul's* Eye a real and certain Indication that such Despisers, &c. were not established in the Faith nor rooted in Christ, but were in a perishing condition; as thine and thy Parties rejecting, despising, contemning, reproaching, slighting, villifying those good, wholesome, la-

voury.

vouy Exhortations, Admonitions, Advice, Councel and Directions which the Spirit of the Lord hath at this day given forth for the well ordering, managing and governing the Affairs of the Church of Christ, are a real and certain Indication, in the Eye that is kept open and single to the Light of Christ Jesus, that *you are not established* in the Faith, nor rooted in Christ, but in a perishing wretched and miserable condition.

Seit. 9. Next thou sayst, *pag. 27. If Christ did stand in need of assistance to establish his Government, how is it possible that man, whose days are but as a Span long, should be capable to establish that Government, of whose increase there shall be no end: But so it is that he doth not stand in need thereof, &c.* Here thou arguest from Christs not needing mans assistance, and mans incapacity to perform. But dost thou think then that Christ doth therefore use mans service in *any thing*, because he stands in need of mans assistance *at all*? Christ doth not make use of men to communicate his mind unto others by, in relation to Government, because he stands in need of their assistance to establish his Government, any more than he makes use of men to Preach his Gospel, because he stands in need of their assistance to publish his Gospel: For he could found his Gospel through all Regions without the Ministry of man. But this is the way and method which he himself hath chosen, and is pleased to use. And though man in himself be altogether unmeet for so great and noble Services, yet he, in whom all Power is, both can, will, and doth fit and capacitate man unto *both*, who otherwise is unable for *either*. And therefore hath Christ given gifts unto men, that he might fit and furnish them to his Service in each of these respects, as appears, 1 Cor. 12. and Ephes. 4.

Thou speakest also of *Christs appearance*, and that *the manner of it hath been and is by his Spirit in us*; and in page 28. Thou appealest, *Whether it be not inconsistent with right Reason and Truth, to conclude, that Christ Jesus the Lord, will establish his Government otherwise, than by his Spirit and in the heart.* This suggestion, *William*, carries in it a most foul and venomous slander: for it insinuates that Friends do conclude that Christ will establish his Government otherwise than by his Spirit, and in the heart; which is *notoriously false* and abominably wicked.

ed. For that the Appearance of Christ is by his Spirit *in us*, and that thereby his Government is set up and established *in the hearts* of his People, hath been and *always is* acknowledged; and thou hast no ground to suggest the contrary. But as his appearance is *in* his People, so it is also *through* his People; as he speaks *in* his People, so he also speaks *through* his People, and that not only to the world, but one to another also. And what he so speaks, *through* one Member to others, those Members so spoken to ought not to reject as the words of man, but receive as the words of Christ: and he that denys this either in word or practice doth so far endeavour to limit and confine the appearance of Christ or Christ in his appearance.

Self. 10. In pag 29. Thou takest occasion to mention the Second days weekly Meeting in *London*, wherein amongst other services such Books as are written for the service of Truth, are usually read over before they are committed to the Press; which thou confesseth to be a necessary service; pag. 31. Yet because thou wouldest find fault with every thing, thou quarrellest with this also. And thy first Cavil is, that *the Scriptures of Truth, so far as thou rememberest, are wholly silent as to any such service acted in any Meetings amongst the Primitive Christians.* And well they may: for the Art of Printing not being invented till about a thousand years after, the means we now have of spreading or defending Truth among the world by Books, was then wanting. But thy chief Objection is, that this Meeting is an *Uncertain Unselected Assembly*, that is, that no certain select number of persons are chosen for that service. This is also objected against Monthly and Quarterly Meetings in your first *Part* pag. 16. and against the Yearly Meeting, in your third *Part* pag. 7. But the Exception favours of a *private Spirit*, that would appropriate such service to *it self*, contrary to the nature of the *universal Spirit* and life of Christ. Thy Instance of the *Seven Deacons* is nothing to the purpose: for their Service being mostly to receive and distribute the Alms of the Church, and to take care of the Poor, a *select Number* of persons was needful, both that the Poor might know unto whom to have recourse for relief, and that the Church might be assured the Service would be faithfully performed: for in such *outward* services, where no certain appointment is made, it sometimes happens, that while

one thinks another will undertake it, and that other thinks he will do it, the service is neglected by both. But in this case, where the service consists in the exercise of the Spirit of Truth and a sound judgement, in examining and weighing such Treatises as are intended to be published for the service of Truth, there is not that reason for a *select* Number, nor a consistency with Truth in excluding others, who may have the mind of God as well as those who should be so chosen. And by the free admission of all such, to whom the Lord hath committed a Dispensation of the Gospel, there is more room for the exercise of those divers Gifts, bestowed on many for the Service of the Church, than where there is a choice of certain Persons excluding all others.

Here again thou makest an *Appeal*, pag. 30. to the impartial and understanding Reader, Whether, according to this form of Government one that is in the place of Paul a Father, may not have the Testimony which he hath through the motion of God's Spirit to publish unto the world for God, over-ruled by Timothy a Son, &c. I answer, There is no danger of that: For Paul and Timothy, the Elder, and the Younger, the Father and the Son in Truth, abiding in that Spirit by which one begat, and t'other was begotten to God, are and will be one. And the youngest Timothy a bidding there, will never oppose what Paul hath through the motion of God's Spirit to publish. But if the Elder swerve from the right way, a Younger than he may help to bring him in again, as we see in the Case of Peter and Paul, Gal. 2. 11, 13. where Paul, though convinced long after Peter, reproved Peter to his face.

From Appealing thouallest to Querying, But suppose (sayest thou) no such Obstruction hath or may appear, yet I query, whether it looks like a part of Christ's Government, for Timothy the Son to be admitted as a Judge over the writings of Paul, who is a Father begot him unto the Truth? This shews thy Ignorance of divine things: For it is neither Timothy that is to judge in such cases, nor yet Paul; but the Spirit of Christ whether in a Timothy or in a Paul, in a young man or in a father, that is to be the Judge. And this both looks like, and is a part of Christ's Government.

In pag. 31. Thou seemest to restrain this Service of perusing Books for the Press, to such as have the gift of discerning Spirits, shutting out those that have the Gifts of Prophe-
 cying

cyng, Teaching and Exhortation as unfit. Nay thou sayest, If peradventure there should become amongst them, whose gifts are to discern Spirits, &c. it becomes not others, not gifted therein, to concern themselves: Yet in page 32. They must be such as are perfectly skilful in all Spiritual gifts, Myseries, and knowledge, relating to the Matters appertaining to God's Kingdom, and the Salvation of Mankind. So uncertain thou art what thou wouldest be at. But I observe, William, Thou didest not lay thy own Book before such skilful Ones in all Spiritual gifts, &c. For thou sayest, pag. 31. Were it so, that I had ought upon me on Truth's behalf, to bring to publick view I should be glad of the Opportunity to lay it before such Brethren, with whom the word of Wisdom, knowledge and discerning of Spirits dwelt. I should be glad of the Opportunity! It seems then thou hadst it not. What was the Matter? were there none among thy Party with whom the word of Wisdom, knowledge and discerning of Spirits dwelt? or was what thou hast brought to publick view, not on Truth's behalf? Thou mayest assign eit'her or both, of these Reasons; for they are both true, no doubt. However, William, In saying, Were it so, that I had ought upon me on Truth's behalf to bring to publick view. Thou hast plainly enough acknowledged, that what thou hast brought to publick view, this Book, this great Book of thine with all its Members and Appurtenances, its Preface, Postscript, Additional Postscript, Appendix and Index, (which hath fouled about 100000 Sheets of Paper) is not on Truth's behalf; And that I hope the Reader will observe Thusmuch to thy first Head.

Sett. II. Thy second Head is pag. 20. That the Members of Christ's Church have not power in cases of difference, arising amongst themselves, touching outward things, to assume Jurisdiction over the Properties and worldly Concerns each of other; when not chosen for that service by the consent of the Members differing. And thou makest as if R. B. had asserted that they have, because he in pag. 39. of his Book speaking of the Power Christ hath invested his Church with, for the composing and removing Differences that may happen within itself, hath thus written, "Secondly, This Order reacheth the taking up and composing of differences as to outward things, which may fall out between Friend and Friend; And then supposing such differences should

R 2

happen,

happen, he saith, " We do boldly aver, as a People gathered together by the Lord unto the same faith, and distinguished from all others by our joynt Testimony and sufferings, that we have Power and authority to decide and remove these things among our selves, without going to others to seek redress. Here is not a word of assuming Jurisdiction Over Property, but only of deciding and removing differences: Yet dost thou run out into a most investive Clamour against R. B. for asserting a Jurisdiction over Property and without consent of Parties. But that it may appear how unrighteous thou art herein, I will transcribe what thou hast set down of R. B's word in this same part of thy Book. And first in they Letter, written soon after the Meeting thou hadest with R. B. at London, to clear him from the misrepresentations thou hadest in this very Treatise of thine given of him, having given a general Account of the Occasion and manner of that Meeting, thou sayest, *In particular he (viz. R. B.) doth declare, That his Book teacheth not, that the Church of Christ hath jurisdiction over the outward concerns of Friends, in case of difference, without the assent of the differing Parties, and that it was far from his intention. For his intention, as he declares, was only to manifest, that Friends ought to submit their cases of difference to the decision of the Church and in case of refractoriness, that such Persons ought to be disowned.* Then in the Postscript which R. B. writ, and thou hast printed, pag. 105. he says, *Whereas some did suppose, that I did ascribe to Friends an absolute Jurisdiction over men's property in outward things; therein I have been greatly mistaken, for I never intended any such thing, but simply to hold forth that which by the Apostle to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. 6. is urged.* &c. In both these places R. B. doth plainly disown the senic thou puttest upon him, and denies it to be his, and this long before the printing of thy Book: So that no pretence of ignorance can excuse thee from a plain design to abuse him. And so earnest thou art therein, that thou sayest, pag. 40. *Whereas some may be so charitable as to conclude, R. B. intends not by his Words, that any should assume authority to decide differences relating to outward things, without consent of the parties concerned; to such (sayest thou) I say, He hath left no room for a reasonable man so to think.* And why so? *Why because sayest thou, he hath written several pages to prove his assertion, which in that case is all unnecessary.* By this it appears

appears thou hadest rather be unjust thy self, than others should be *charitable* to R. B. for herein thou misrepresentest him. Those several pages thou sayest he writ to prove his Assertion, were writ to shew, that the parties differing ought to submit their cause to the judgment of their Brethren; which is but what thou thy self confesses they ought to do, pag. 20, 35, 37. But the best on't is, If R. B. may have *justice*, he will not stand in need of *charity* in this case: for there's enough in his Book to manifest his intention was not that some should assume authority to dispose of other mens Estates at their pleasure. For in pag. 40. of his Book, he ascribes the reconcilement and compo-
 sure of difference to the Efficacy of Truth. And in pag. 41. he is somewhat more expresse, "In matters, says he, wherein
 "two Parties are Opposite in the case of Meum and Tuum, it is
 "somewhat hard to please both, except where the Power of
 "Truth, and the righteous Judgment thereof reaching to that of
 "God in the Conscience, hath brought to a true acknowledg-
 "ment, him that hath been mistaken or in the wrong, &c..
 All which has plain reference to such as submit their cause to the judgment of their Brethren. But for such as refuse so to submit their Cause, he is so far from pretending a Power to seize on their Estates, and dispose them, that he says expressly, pag. 41.
 "Now suppose any should be so Pettish and Humourous, as
 "not to agree in such matters to the Judgment of his Brethren,
 "and to go before Unbelievers, &c. If there be any such (says
 "he, that) have been or appear to be of us, as suppose there is
 "not a Wise man among us all, nor an Honest man that is
 "able to judge among his Brethren; we shall not covet to
 "meddle in their matter: This is far enough sure from usurping
 Authority over their Estates, from assuming a Jurisdiction over their Properties. So that it appears what R. B. declared to thee in the Meeting at London, to be his meaning in this Case, was no other (though in other words) than what his Book contained. And yet all this will not excuse him from the lash of a slanderous Tongue; so bent thou art to abuse him. But having in some measure vindicated him, or rather shewed how he vindicates himself, let me now take notice a little of what thou sayst upon this Subject.

First then I observe in pag. 35. Thou agreest that *If differences happen between two Brethren, not intending to wrong each other,*
 Truth

*Truth will lead them to choose and submit their Cause to the Faithful Brethren. And secondly, that where two Brethren are at variance, touching their outward concerns, if either of them shall refuse to hear the Church admonishing him so to submit his Cause, he should by Christs direction be reputed as Heathen man, that is Excommunicated or cast out of the Society and Communion of the Church. These two Cases, thou layest, duly weighed and considered, seem to thee to be comprehensive of all Cases of difference touching outward Concerns, that may happen amongst the Members of the Church of Christ. Pag. 37. And thou concludest there is no need of the Churches Authority in either of these Cases; since in the former Case, the Power of Truth in the Parties concerned will oblige them to submit to the thing that is just: And in the latter Case, the Party that refuses to hear the Church, having thereby cut himself off from being a Member, his Case is without the Churches Cognizance. But William, though such an one as hath refused to hear the Church, hath thereby cut himself off from being really and indeed a Member, yet until the Church, by her Sentence and Judgment against such an one, hath declared him cut off, and that she owneth him not as a Member, such an one may continue to walk in his former Profession, and remain in *show* and appearance a Member still, and be so reputed by the World, whereby the reproach occasioned by the wrong and injury he hath done is not removed, but remains as a Scandal upon the Church. Nor can the wronged Brother seek remedy elsewhere, until he who hath done the wrong, and rejected the Churches Admonition, be by the Judgment and Sentence of the Church denounced as an Heathen man, and declared cut off from the Society and Membership of the Church. So that in this Case there is need of the Churches Power; and the Church is not destitute of Power and means to remove the Scandal, by removing him that brought it. But though thou takest these two Cases to be comprehensive of all that may happen, yet give me leave to propose thee a third Case, which I take to be not comprehended under either of these; and that is this. Suppose two Brethren are at variance touching their Properties and outward concerns, and he that hath done the wrong be so deep (as some are) in the Creaturely Wisdom and Subtilty, that he will not plainly deny or refuse to submit*

mit his Cause to an Hearing and Judgment; but will insist (as thou dost) that he ought to have equal share in choosing his Judges; and thereupon chooses one like himself; unjust, unreasonable, self-willed; that will not yield to right, and so the difference cannot by that means be ended. What's to be done, William, in such a Case? Must the Scandal remain upon the Church? Shall the wronged Brother have no right? Where shall he seek it? From without? That he cannot, because the other, that hath wronged him, appears a Brother, remains in outward Profession a Member, is not cut off by the Churches Sentence, is not declared an Heathen. Shall he have recourse to the Church for Right? That he may; but after thy way of arguing, and according to the poor pittance of Power thou art pleased to allow the Church, she will be so far from being in a capacity to help him, that she will not be able to help her self; so ill a posture hast thou put her into. For thou makest the Right of choosing Judges, to hear and end differences arising between Members of the Church, to lye wholly and only in the Parties differing, and that without any exception; and allowest the Church no further Power, than to Counsel and Admonish them to choose some persons, and to submit their Cause to the Judgment of those whom they themselves have chosen; and to disown them if they refuse this. But if they do not refuse this, but do choose (though the Injurious Party chooses such as I mentioned before, that is like himself, and that will not yield to what is Right) the Church then, according to thy way of reasoning, can have no ground, no pretence, no colour to deny or disown such an one, because he hath not neglected to hear the Church, but hath heard and done as much as thou allowest the Church Power to require of him. And so the Church must lye under the Scandal, and the wronged Brother sit down by the loss, without means of remedy. But has Christ (dost thou think) left his Church in no better Case than so? Has he made no better Provision for ending of differences, and doing right between Brother and Brother, than this comes to? O ill condition of the Church of Christ, were this it! To what purpose should he that is wronged complain of his wrong to the Church, if he that doth the wrong might stop the course of Justice, and persist in his doing wrong, and the Church could not help it? Yet that is the result of thy reasoning, William, and the natural product

product of thy Principle. For if the Malefactor, the Wrongdoer, the Injurious person, may stand upon it as his Privilege and Right to choose the Person or Persons to whom he will submit his Cause, and may refuse to submit his Cause to any but whom he himself chooses; then it is evident that by choosing such as are like himself, he may *stop the course of Justice*, and persist in his doing wrong: For if it be his Right to choose, the Church cannot bar him of it; she can only admonish him to choose: And if thereupon he do choose, she cannot disown him, because he hath not neglected to hear her: And if she do not disown him, the Brother that is wronged by him cannot seek remedy *from without*, because he still bears the Character and outward appearance of a Brother and Fellow-Member. Thus hast thou *broached an Opinion, William*, that in its natural tendency *dams up the current of Justice*, and leaves the Church in a poor condition, unable to right a wronged Member, or to relieve itself. Nor is this with respect to *Property* and outward concerns only, but with respect to such things as are of a *Conscientious and Religious* nature also. For in *pag. 40.* thou sayest, *How unreasonable it is that matters of Worldly property, and things relating to Conscience, should be decided by such Assemblies, without an Election for that Service by the Parties differing, I leave to the Impartial and Judicious Reader to savour.* The Reader no doubt, if he be *Judicious and Impartial*, will easily savour whence this springs, and what the tendency of it is, even to fill the Church with *Errors, Heresies, Schisms, Contention*, while he that shall broach the *fonleſt Error*, and make the *greatest Schism* in the Church, shall not be judged by the Church, but by some of *his own choosing*, by whom he may be well assured neither his Opinion nor practice shall be condemned: This is indeed a likely way to *rend and divide* the Church by *Schisms*, to corrupt and defile it by *Errors and Heresies*, and to perpetuate Contentions in it remediless. Had this course been held in *John Petrot's Case*, the Error that he introduced, and the Schism that he was the Author of, might have raged in the Church to this day. For if he had insisted upon it as his Right to have an equal share in choosing those to whom the hearing of his Cause should be committed, and accordingly had pick'd out a certain number of the *most obstinate* of his own party, what could the Issue in likelihood have been, but that they would have

have been as ready to justify, as others that kept their standing in Truth, might have been to condemn him. And 'tis not unlikely but such a confidence may have prick'd on thee and thy Party to offer sometimes such a like Meeting, for the hearing of differences betwixt you and Friends, whereof one half should be your own choosing. But the Lord took another course in Perro's Business: For he kindled the Spirit of Judgment in his Church, until it brake forth into a pure flame, which burnt up the Dross the Enemy had brought in, and purged many simple-hearted ones, that had been deceived and defiled therewith. The remembrance of that day is joyous to many: And the Souls of the Righteous would be right glad to see the return of many now from the Captivity into which the Enemy hath led, and in which he yet holds them.

Thou sayest, in pag. 38. *Neither the Scripture without us, nor the Light within us, do evidence, that under the Spiritual Government of Christ, there is any need to establish Orders or Laws touching Worldly Property, or for the Members of Christ to assume Jurisdiction therein, without assent of the Parties differing.* For since his kingdom is not of this World, is it not against the Nature of his Government, to exercise by constraint, a Jurisdiction in matters relating to this World? The Scriptures do evidence, that under the Spiritual Government of Christ, there is need to establish Order and Law. And Christ himself (the best judge of the need thereof) did accordingly establish an Order or Law for the removing of Offences or differences arising amongst any of the Members of his Church, whether touching Worldly property or any thing else. And though his Kingdom be not of this World, or of the Nature of this World, yet is his Kingdom exalted above the World, and over the Kingdoms of this World. And the pure Principle of Justice, Equity and Righteousness, that flows from him, ought to have the decision and determination of all differences arising touching Worldly Property, in all the Kingdoms of this World, but more especially and particularly in his own Church. And as for constraint, the Church uses no other than what they themselves acknowledged they may do, namely to declare those that neglect to hear her, or refuse to take her Counsel, as Heathen men, cut off from her Society. But thy talking of constraining the Subjects under Christs Government, is a kind of Solacium,

William, and Incongruity of Speech : For since none are truly Christs Subjects, who do not obey the Law of his Government, it is absurd to talk of Constraining his Subjects unto such an Obedience; for that supposes them his Subjects that are not Subject to him.

But, *William*, by what thou sayest in pag. 41. it is manifest that, whatever thy pretences elsewhere are, thy design is to strike at the root of the Church-Government, and to allow the Church no Authority at all. For thou sayst, *If the Assent of Parties was intended, and that the Order of this Government reached not to this Case without such Assent, it naturally follows, that the Power and Authority pretended to in this Case, is none at all.* Now the Power and Authority asserted by R. B. to be in the Church of Christ, was a Power and Authority to decide and remove differences; and thy great quarrel with R. B. was because thou apprehendest that he had excluded the Assent of Parties (though he told thee he never intended so) yet now thou sayst, *If the Assent of Parties was intended, and that the Order of this Government reach'd not to this Case without such Assent, it naturally follows, that the Power and Authority pretended to in this Case, is none at all.* So that when thou comest to speak plain, Assent or Non-Assent is much alike; the Church has no Power (in thy Opinion) either without Assent, or with Assent, to decide differences, no Authority to remove them. And 'tis observable that when in the same page, to prevent a misunderstanding of thy sense, thou givest something which thou callest thy Testimony, that part of it which relates to the Church is, *That it ought to be as an incumbent duty on the Members of Christs Church to be watching over one another, so as that by wholesome Councel, Admonition and sound Doctrine, all Variance, Strife, Emulation, Rents and Divisions, both in relation to Temporal, as well as Spiritual matters, may as much as in them lyes, be kept out from amongst the Members of Christs Body.* But if, notwithstanding all the Churches care and watchfulness, Variance, Strife, &c. get in, here is no mention of any Power the Church hath to get it out again. Thou sayst indeed, with respect to them through whom it gets in, *That it is the duty of such, who are at variance, to request such Brethren as are skilled in the matters touching which they differ, to hear and determine the Cause, and then of a willing and ready mind (and not as a constraint) to submit*

unto

unto such determination. This thou sayst is their duty: But what if either of them choose such, as though skilful enough, yet are so linked by Interest, Affection, or otherwise, to him that hath done and persists in the wrong, as that they will not bring the Cause to any just and right determination, but will abet and defend the Wrong-doer in the Wrong and Injury he hath done? Hast thou *no further sense* in this Case, than what relates to the duty of the Parties differing? *No sense at all* of any Power in the Church, to remove such Injustice and Scandal? Strange! that thou shouldst be *so sensible* on the one part, and *so senseless* on the other! But I proceed to thy third Head.

Self. 12. In the bottom of thy 41th. page, thou pretendest to set down an Assertion of R. B's concerning the ground of Schisms; and thou dost it thus. R. B. (sayst thou) *Asserts* page 11. *That the ground of Schisms, Divisions, or Rents in the Body is, when any Member assumes another place than is allotted it, or being gone from the Life, lets in the Eye that watches for evil.* His words are, [being gone from the Life and Unity of the Body, and loosing the sense of it, lets in the Murmurer, the Eye that watches for Evil, &c.] *This Position*, thou acknowledgest, *is Truth, and rightly stated*: Yet thou must have a sting at it. What R. B. Asserts, be it never so true, and never so rightly stated, shall hardly escape thee without a Cavil: Thou'lt come in with a [*But yet notwithstanding*] if it be possible. Here, though thou confessest R. B's Assertion to be Truth, and rightly stated, thou sayst, *But yet notwithstanding I cannot but testify, That if any Member of Christs body doth recommend that Administration or Operation, wherein by Gods Spirit he is exercised unto his Brethren, and shall judge all such dark Spirits, and out of the Unity of the Body, who on such a recommendation become not exercised as he is, or doth not immediatly close with his Experience and Operation, though otherwise Faithful to the measure of Grace received, such an one so judging, may justly be judged of the Lord, as a person not only assuming another place in the Body than is allotted him, but also as endeavouring to draw others into the like snare, pag. 42.* This Testimony of thine is dark, ambiguous and uncertain: For thou dost not declare whether the Administration or Operation thou speakest of, be private or publick, particular or

general: Though which soever it be, *Thy Testimony is wrong.* For if on the one hand thou meanest, that any Member hath recommended to his Brethren his own peculiar and particular Experience (as thy word is) for them to be exercised in, hath judged them for not immediately closing therewith, then is thy *suggestion false*, and thy *insinuation slanderous*. If on the other hand thou intendest, that the Administration which such a Member is exercised in by Gods Spirit, is of a *general extent*, relating not to that particular Member only, but to the other Members in *general*, and as such is recommended to the Brethren; then art thou guilty of great Confusion and Contradiction, in saying those that close not with it, are *Faithful to the measure of Grace received*: For what by the Spirit of God is recommended to any, will be closed with by such; if they are Faithful to the measure of Grace received; and to suggest the contrary, is to oppose the Spirit to the Grace of God. Besides, to charge any Member who is exercised by Gods Spirit, with assuming another place in the Body than is allotted him, is great weakness; but to charge such an one with endeavouring to draw others into a snare, is great wickedness: For the Spirit of God cannot ensnare any one, neither can he that is exercised by Gods Spirit, while so exercised.

Thou sayest pag. 42. *'Twas an exhortation in the beginning of the day which in these latter years hath dawned amongst us, Though thou grow slow, yet grow sure. And this sure growing, thou sayest, was Obedience after conviction, or Obedience to the measure of Grace received. All performances before, with respect to worship or services for God, were accounted but will-worships or will-services, and therefore many (thou sayest) whose faces were Sion-ward did rightly testify on this wise, I must stay untill I be convinced, &c. And yet this kind of language is (thou sayest according to thy undertaking) too reflectingly spoken of by the aforesaid Author, witness his 13th. page.* This carries in it a two-fold Reflection. First upon Friends in the beginning, implying that Friends in the beginning did put many whole faces were *Sion-ward* upon will-worship, upon will-services, upon acting before or without conviction: What cause else or ground could such then have to say, *I must stay until I be convinced.* This is a false and foul Reflection upon Friends in the beginning. Secondly, upon R. B. as if he did press Obedience before

conviction; which is false with respect to him also. For he doth not ~~pretend~~ ^{pretend} to obey before conviction, but recounts the manner of Truth's breaking forth at the beginning of the day in sharp Testimonies against that self saving Spirit, that would shun the Cross under a pretence of not being convinced of this or the other thing wherein hardship lay or suffering appeared, and yet seem to own the light and profess obedience to the measure of Grace received. Thereby reflecting an insufficiency in the grace, while they would not own a conviction by it in some cases, nor yet acknowledge their disobedience to it. So that here as in other places, *thou art found a false Accuser of R. B. and an Abettor of such as defame the grace of God*, in charging their own unfaithfulness upon the Grace: for he that affirms he is obedient to the measure of Grace received, and yet says he is not convinced of this or that thing which is plainly contrary to Truth, doth in effect say that the measure of Grace which is given unto him, is not sufficient to convince him of that which is plainly contrary to Truth. But the most certain and undeniable Doctrine of truth is, *That the grace is sufficient*. And therefore if any man be not convinced by it, 'tis not because the grace is *defective*, but because he is *negligent* for which he is justly to be condemned, as well as those mentioned, *John 3. 16, 19*. But thou hast prepared a defence for such here, as thou and thy party elsewhere (1 part pag. 29.) making a pretence of want of light, or clearness of conviction, a Cloke for unfaithfulness to conviction; by which if some had not reasoned Truth from themselves, through the deceitfulness of the Serpent, there would not; there could not have been so many at this day, that have profest Truth some ten some twenty years, and can pay Tithes without any acknowledgement of Evil therein. Is it not favioury language for such to say I must stay until I be convinced! Can such as see not so manifest Evil, be said to be faithful to the measure of Grace received? And though thou and thy Party would sooth up such unfaithful ones, telling them the Lord may wink, &c. Second Part, pag. 88. Yet let such know, and that from a better Testimony than yours, That he who in days past winked at Ignorance; now calleth all men every where to repent, *Acts 17. 30*. For therefore hath he manifested himself unto men, that they may be left without excuse, *Rom. 1. 20*.

Self. 13. Another Cavil thou hast at R. B. is for searching the Apostle's writings. He has found that there it seems, which thou tellest us pag. 24. thou dost not remember to be there; and which a man may well perceive thou dost not like to hear of, and that's the word [ORDER.] This search of his displeases thee; and yet on the other hand in 2. part, pag 25. Thou blamest some (I know not whom, nor thy self neither, I believe) for neglecting to read the Scriptures, and impute their Ignorance to that neglect. 'Tis an hard matter I perceive to please such discontented captious Spirits. Some are too Ignorant, and Some too knowing; Some too idle, and Some too hasty; Some to neglective of the Scriptures, and Some too scrupulous inquisitive and searching. And this it seems is R. B's Offence in thy opinion. Thou art doubtful he is designing to advance some outward Government by man or men; else (sayest thou pag. 43.) what's the meaning that the aforesaid Author hath made such a diligent Search amongst the Apostles Writings after the words [Order, Rule, Command, Govern, Government, Traditions, and such like] Surely, William, were thou of the same Spirit the Apostles were of thou wouldest not blame R. B. for searching the Apostle's writings, nor carp at what is found therein: but rather have applied thy self to consider whether R. B. had mis-rendred any of the Apostles writings (as thou hast done) or Applied them otherwise than the Apostles did. If thou couldst convict R. B. of that, thou might'st have some colour of Exception; till then thou dost but beat the air. Certain it is that the words thou here cavillest about are in the Apostles writings, and used (for ought thou hast proved to the contrary) in the same sense, and to the same purpose, that R. B. hath exprest them. And canst thou imagin any so idle as to imagin they were meer idle words and empty sounds, of no real use nor signification? Did the Apostles exhort the Believers to obey them that had the Rule over them (Heb. 13. 17.) and were there none that had? When Paul besought the Thessalonians to know them that laboured among them, and were over them in the Lord, &c. (1 Thess. 5. 12.) did he speak at random? Were there no such? When he uses the word [Command] 2 Thess. 3. 6, 7. and speaks of the authority given him by the Lord (2 Cor. 12. 8.) did he usurp an authority? Did he exercise a power that belonged not unto him?

him? Doth he not say expressly the Lord had given it to him? and wilt thou charge him with falshood? Come, *William*, come, give over trifling, and speak out plain. Either charge the Apostles with imposing upon the Churches, and exercising an usurped Power: or fairly confess they had a Power, Authority, Command, Rule, committed to them by the Lord for the edification of the Church. And if thou must grant it was so then; Offer at least some shew or colour of Reason why it may not be so now, or cease contending against it.

Scit. 14. In pag. 44. Thou pretendest to recite out of R. B's Book some Sentences of Scripture which he had quoted: but even this thou hast done so brokenly and mangled, that it argues great unfairness; for where he had set down the text plainly, 1 *Thefs.* 5. 12. *And we beseech you Brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you;* Thou hast set it only thus, *Know them that are over you,* leaving out [in the Lord] So 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. Where R. B. hath set down the full Text, thus, *For though I should boast somewhat more of our authority (which the Lord hath given us for edification and not for your destruction) I should not be ashamed: Thou hast given it only thus, Though I should boast somewhat more of our authority,* leaving out [which the Lord hath given us, &c.] What else could the design of this be, but to mislead the Reader into an Apprehension that R. B. had cited the Scriptures thus, leaving out what mentioned the *divine Institution* of that authority power and Rule, that so they might think (as thou wouldst have them) R. B. had contended for an *humane authority* of man's setting up, and not of God's appointing. As for the next Scripture Quotations which thou citest out of him (and givest thus, *If any obey not our word, remember them which have the rule over you, and submit your selves. These filthy Dreamers despise Dominion.*) Thou hast so maimed them, and rendred them so incongruous, that I should have taken it for an Error of the Press (though not corrected in the Errata) but that in thy following lines, which thou printest as if they were punctually taken out of his Book, thou dealest rather worse (if worse may be) with him, leaving out what did not please thy pallet, yet without giving any hint or ——— whereby the Reader might understand there was any word omitted. How-
ever

ever, in transcribing what thou hast given of R. B's word,
 I will insert in a different letter thy Omissions, that others may
 see how little thou art to be trusted. Thou begins them thus,
 "There can nothing be more plain from these Testimonies
 "than (here thou skippest these words, [That, the antient
 "Apostles and primitive Christians practiced Order and Government
 "in the Church;] and goest on thus) that some did appoint and
 "ordain certain things. (Here again thou skippest these words
 "[condemn and approve certain practices, as well as Doctrines by the
 "Spirit of God] and then goes on thus) That there lay an
 "Obligation in point of duty on others to obey; That this
 "was no Encroachment nor Imposition on their Christian li-
 "berty, nor any ways contradictory to their being inwardly
 "[and immediatly] led by the Spirit of God in their hearts;
 "And lastly, that such as are in the true feeling and sense, will
 "find it their places to obey, and be one with the Church of
 "Christ in such like cases; and that it is such as have lost their
 "sense and feeling of the life of the body, that dissent and are
 "disobedient, under the false pretence of Liberty. Thirdly,
 "I judge there will need no great argument to prove the People
 "of God may and do well to exercise the like government upon
 "the very like Occasion. Thus much thou sayst may be collected
 out of R. B's 26, 27, and 28, pages. But after all thy mang-
 ling of R. B's Words, why didst thou not answer them, Wil-
 liam? Why not confute them, if false? Why not discover the
 Error of them, if there were any in them? R. B's Words
 are plain enough, and his Inferences from those Scriptures so
 natural and conclusive, that it seems thou sawest no way to re-
 fuse them. For it is evident that the antient Apostles and Primitive
 Christians practiced Order and Government in the Church; It is
 evident that some did appoint and ordain certain things, condemn
 and approve certain Practices as well as Doctrines, and that by the
 Spirit of God; It is evident that there lay an Obligation in point of
 duty upon others to obey and submit; It is evident that there was no
 Encroachment or Imposition upon their Christian liberty, nor any
 ways contradictory to their being inwardly and immediatly led by
 the Spirit of God in their hearts; And lastly that such as are in
 the true feeling and sense will find it their places to obey, and be one
 with the Church of Christ in such like cases; and that it is such as
 have lost their sense and feeling of the life of the body, that dissent
 and

and are disobedient under the false pretence of Liberty. These Conclusions, *William*, are plain and undeniable; and so I suppose thou thoughtest them to be, and therefore didst not adventure to deny them, but slippedst in a Marginal note upon them thus, *'Tis to be doubted, his meaning is, others ought to obey, whether they see it their duty or no; as his 68. page seems to import.* But without all doubt there is no ground either from his words here, or in his 68. pag. so to doubt: for though in pag. 68. he said thus [“Neither will the pretences of any contradicting them (that is, the Church of Christ, when met together and giving a positive judgment by the Spirit of God) or refusing to submit upon the account they see it not, or to excuse them from being really guilty of disobeying God.”] Yet those words do not at all import his meaning to be, that they should obey, though they don't see; but the true import of them is, that in as much as their not seeing is *their own fault*, the effect of their own negligence, they must not think it will acquit them before God, from the guilt of disobedience, to say they did not see it. And in other places of his Book, he cut off all occasion for any to think that he meant, they should obey though they see it not their duty: For he makes their Obedience to spring from the sense of their duty. In pag. 53. treating of the Power the Church of Christ hath to decide in matters both fundamental and of less moment, by the Spirit of God (without which he is positive, no decision nor Decree in what ever matters is available) he says, “The Church being acted, moved, assisted and led by the Spirit of God, and no other ways, to pronounce a positive Judgment, That no doubt will be found obligatory upon all such who have a sense and feeling of the mind of the Spirit, though rejected by such as are not watchful, and so are out of the feeling and unity of the life. In pag. 55. he says, “Those who have a true and right discerning, may in and by the Power of God authorizing them (and no otherwise) condemn and judge such things; and they so doing it, it will be Obligatory upon all the Members that have a true sense, because they will feel it to be so, and therefore submit to it. The submission here is grounded upon the true sense and feeling. In pag. 67. speaking of the universal privilege of Gods people under the New Covenant, to be all taught of God, he sayeth, “Though this privilege is as truly exercised in some by assenting to and

" obeying what God commands and reveals through others,
 " they feeling unity with it in the life, as by such who by the
 " revelation and command of Gods Spirit, hold forth his will
 " to his people in certain particulars, which the same Spirit
 " leads and commands them to obey. Here the obedience is
 grounded upon the leading of the Spirit of God, and the feeling
 of Unity in the Life with that which is commanded. But in
pag. 86. he is more full and positive; for speaking of obeying
 in such Cases, he says expressly, " Yet say I not any ought
 " to do it before they be clear. More Instances might be
 brought of the like import. Now, *William*, seeing thou hast
 so diligently (as thou sayst) searched that Book of R. B's over
 and over, and there must needs have read these passages, how
 couldst thou find in thy heart to say, *'Tis to be doubted, his mean-*
ing is, others ought to obey, whether they see it their duty or no?
 Didst thou drop this suggestion, because thou knewest not what
 Answer to make?

Self. 15. In *pag. 45.* Thou settest down more Fragments of
 Scriptures and other matter taken out of the 23, 24, and 25 pages
 of R. B's Book, and Printed, as before, as if they were R. B's
 intire Sentences. But in these, as in the former, thou hast left
 out what thou dost not like, and yet taken in more than thou
 knowest how to Answer; as will appear anon from the Obser-
 vationsthou hast made. For thou dost not deny R. B's Assertions,
 though thou carpest at them; but having pick'd and cull'd
 six of his Pages for Matter to observe upon; the Observa-
 tions thou hast made are so few (though enough, unless they
 were more to the purpose) so general, so impertinent and
 forreign to the matter, that they abate not a Tittle of the force
 of R. B's Arguments. Thy first Observation is (*pag. 46.*) *That*
here is nothing spoken in these Scriptures, of the commands of the
Church; and that if God hath at any time moved an Apostle on some
occasion to write unto a peculiar Church (and that perhaps with
relation to particular Members only) by way of command; yet this,
according to right reason, is no ground for any Assembly of Persons,
under the Notion of the Church of Christ, to give forth positive Com-
mands, in expectation that all the Members of Christs Church must
obey the same, whether they have a sense thereof from the measure
of Truth in themselves or no. This Observation is but an *Arti-*
ficial

scial colour and device to avoid the force of R. B's quotations and arguments. For first, whether those Scriptures speak of the Commands of the Church in general, is not the question; that they speak of the Commands of some particular Members of the Church, and that very expressly too, is evident, and thou dost not deny it. Secondly, to say that *if God hath at any time moved an Apostle on some occasion to write unto a peculiar Church by way of command, yet this is no ground for any Assembly, &c. to give forth positive Commands, &c.* is a very weak shift: for who, professing Truth, did ever affirm, or yet imagin, that God's moving one to write, (whether by way of Command, or howsoever otherwise) could be a ground for others so to write, *unless so moved?* No, *William*, thou knowst full well that no Friends do so hold; and therefore thy Observation is very idle and *fallacious*. Thou needest not have extended it to an Assembly of Persons, or have argued from one to many; for it is as true of Particulars, that God's having moved an Apostle to write, &c. is no ground for any other whether Apostle or private Member, to write so too. But he that moved an Apostle so to write, may be allowed I hope to move his Church so to write, if he see cause; and his Church, or any Members thereof, being so moved, may yet ought so to write, and will be justified therein: for it is neither the number, nor quality of Persons, but the motion of the heavenly Power, that impowers any so to write, and gives authority to what is so written. But though God's moving one to give forth his mind by way of command, be not a ground for any other to undertake *unmoved* to do the like: Yet it is a strong and full proof, that as there are *different states* and *growths* in the Church of God, and *diversities of gifts* given by Christ for the benefit thereof; so God hath thought fit, even in this Gospel-Dispensation, to set some *in his Power* over others in the Church, who are to watch for their Souls, *Heb. 13. 17.* and therefore are invested with an authority by God for their edification, *2 Cor. 10. 8.* And this being the appointment of God himself, it must needs be an horrible Impiety in any to suggest, *That this is contrary to the New-Covenant.* As for the Tayl or Tag of thy Sentence [*viz. Whether they have a Sense thereof from the measure of Truth in themselves or no*] I have cut it off before.

Thy second Observation is upon R. B's quoting the words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 4. 15. *In Christ Jesus I have begotten you, through the Gospel*; Whence thou layest R. B. concludes that Paul did mainly insist upon his begetting them unto the Truth, as an Argument to persuade them to obey his positive charge to follow him; and thereupon thou dost infer, that those who have begotten any to the Truth, are the fittest to rule over such whom they have begotten. And upon this Inference thou hast raised a Query, *Whether those who would rule over such whom they have not gathered, are not Intruders and Busy-Bodies, meddling with that which concerns others more than themselves?* To this I say, first, that whereas this Query implies a selfish ambitious desire and earnestness in some to rule over others, it is a false suggestion; It is not so amongst the Lord's People. Secondly, *William*, thou art too hasty in thy Conclusion: for if such as have gathered be said to be the fittest, yet that doth not imply but others also may be fit: for seeing it is God that fitteth, he can fit whom he pleaseth. Since therefore Rule in the Church of God is not absolutely and strictly assigned to them only who have been Instrumental in begetting and gathering, so as to exclude all others, it is an unfavoury Reflection (though but by way of Query) that such as have not been exercised in gathering, &c. are intruders and busy-bodies. And since the Comparative Particle [more] in the close of the Query, implies that such (as have not been exercised in gathering) are or may be, concerned, though not so much as others; surely it must be great injustice to brand such for Intruders and busy-bodies, for meddling with that which, it is confessed, concerns them, though it may concern others more. Now that some may be helpful and useful Instruments in the Government of the Church, who have not been employed in the publick Ministry for begetting and gathering to truth, both the diversities of Gifts, the pleasure of the Giver, and the nature of the thing in self, evince. Of this sort no doubt were some of them, whom the Apostle advises Timothy concerning, 1 Tim. 5. 17. *The Elders that rule well, let them be had in double Honour, especially they which labour in the word and Doctrine.* It seems there were some then that were Elders, that ruled, and ruled well too, who yet did not labour in the word and Doctrine: else what need had there been for such a distinction? This also was safely worded and sufficiently

only guarded in R. B's Book, pag. 68, 70, 71. which hadst thou observed with an equal mind, it might have saved thee the pains of an impertinent Query.

Seit. 16. Being fallen on a sudden from Observing to Querying, thou now for a while runnest on in that Road, tumbling out Queries thick and threefold [*I may well Query (sayest thou) Moreover, I Query; I cannot but again Query*] all in the space of half a pag. Well, though I might say of thy Queries, as thou dost of what thou hast taken out of R. B's Book, [*If this be worthy Observation, &c.*] yet I intend a down-right answer, and therefore to the present Query, *Whether any of these foregoing Scriptures give the least countenance for whole Assemblies to minister by their writings, that which may be matter of Faith, and relative to the conscience, and so be a bond thereon, before their understanding is illuminated; especially when what they do minister first springs from the gift either but of one, or at most but a very few of them:* I say (singing out that Clause [*before their understanding is illuminated*] which carries nothing but slander in it) that what ever Scriptures thou hast taken notice of, there is a Scripture cited by R. B. which plainly shews, that an whole Assembly did minister by their writing that which was matter of faith, and relative to the conscience, and to be a bond thereon too, and that is *Acts. 15.* The Apostles, Elders and Brethren, verse 23; the whole Church at Jerusalem, verse 22. did minister by writing unto the Church in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia, that which was both matter of faith, and relative to the conscience. And as for the latter part of the Query, it is manifest in that great instance, that what is there ministered by the Apostles, Elders, Brethren, *whole Church at Jerusalem*, did spring first from the gift of either but one, or at most but a very few of them: For we read of but two of them that spake in the Case though no doubt there were more in the disputing part; namely *Peter* and *James*, the latter of whom having delivered his Sentence, verse 19, 20. it pleased the Apostles and Elders with the whole Church, verse 22. And the holy Ghost too, verse 18. And according to the Sentence of *James* were the letters written, signed and sent in the name, and as the sense and judgment of the whole Church, verse 23. And thus thou wilt see that what first springs from the gift either of but one, or at most but a very few,

was ministred in writing to an whole great Assembly, yea to many Assemblies, in *Antioch*, *Syria* and *Cilicia*; And so thy Query is answered. Besides, in those Epistles written by *Paul*, in one of which *Sothemes*, 1 Cor. 1. 1. in others *Timothy*, 2 Cor. 1. 1. *Philip*. 1. 1. *Col.* 1. 1. and in others *Silvanus* and *Timothy* joyntly, 1 and 2 *Thess.* 1. 1. and in another, *All the Brethren that were with him*, Gal. 1. 2. are joynd with him, it is more than probable that what is ministred (which no man sure will deny to be matters of faith, and relative to the conscience) did spring at first from the gift in *Paul* only.

Thy other Query is, *Whether the endeavouring to obtain a multitude of hands to confirm and approve that which is given forth by one, or at least a very few, may not become a Temptation to many to run beyond their own lines; and when they have so done, instead of waiting on their own gift, make it their business to stand by what they have done, though it may prove no better (in the best sense) than a standing by the Gifts of others, out of, and in the neglect of their own gifts? And so (sayst thou) such may become but little honour to the Brother, who ministred in his own gift, as the Oracle of God: and not only so, but little credit to the Truth, if such by meddling in things without their line, bring forth confusion and disorder: For what (sayst thou) can be the Off-spring of such, who labour and travel in the things they understand not, but the Brats of Babylon? To this Query of thine I think no better Answer can be given, than to refer thee to the *Wiltshire* Paper, and the Paper of Prescriptions and Orders given by thy Separate Brethren in *Westmoreland*, the one subscribed by 126 the other by 87; a Multitude of hands, I trow, but how obtained, I need not (I suppose) inform thee. From whose particular gift those Papers did at first spring, I will not pretend to know; but truly, *William*, they who subscribed them, to use thy own phrase, have become but little honour to that Brother of theirs (whoever he was) that ministred them (no doubt) in his own gift, not in the gift of God: And therefore it is no wonder that both he and they have been no credit, but dishonour to the Truth, by meddling in things without their line, and thereby bringing forth Confusion and disorder. But that thou, *William*, in the midst of thy labour and travel to bring forth these difficult Queries, shouldst have so quite forgotten those Brats of Babylon ('tis thy own phrase, *William*, be not offended at it) the *West-**

moreland and Wiltshire Papers before-mentioned, which were the off-spring of such who laboured and travelled in the things they understood not (as the honest Retractions of some of the best of them, whom God hath shewed mercy to, do acknowledge) may well be wondred at. Surely, *William*, hadst thou at all considered how forcibly thy Invective would recoil, and how heavy it would unavoidably fall upon thy self and thy own Party, thou wouldst not have found so briskly declaiming (as thou dost) against forwardly Spirits, that pin their faiths upon other mens sleeves, and say Amen to what other men say, before they have an understanding opened to see the same.

Thy suggesting this as an usual saying [Can the Brethren Err?] sounds but like one of thy usual flanders; at casting out which thou seemest to have a peculiar faculty. But as usual as thou makest this saying to be, canst thou tell who ever said it? Canst thou fix it upon any particular? Thou art not Ignorant, I suppose, of the Maxim, *Deceit lurks in generals*.

Thou speakest also of some, pag. 47. who thou sayst make such an use of those Scriptures concerning Corah, &c. as that they give Occasion of Jealousy to some to conclude, that there are some do believe, That God hath raised up some outward Person to be among the Children of light at this day like unto Moses, &c. Having spoken to this elsewhere, I shall here only observe, That thy jealousy concerning the belief of others proceeds from unbelief in thy self; and hath no foundation in Truth, but is a groundless suggestion and malicious scandal against the Children of light.

Yet upon this surmise thou sayst, Among the Children of light in these our latter days, I never understood of any deserving an higher Title, than an Elder or Ministering Friend, 'tis much thou wilt admit the Title of an Elder for some of thy Party have scarce had patience to hear the word [Elder] mentioned. But if I thought it would enlarge thy understanding in this point (which in some others is large enough already) I could inform thee of one who in a public Meeting gave *John Story* the title of Angel (which in the common acceptance of the word is an higher order thou knowst than an Elder.) How well *John Story* deserved that title, let others judge; but that he hath not kept his first Estate, but hath left his habitation which he once had in the light

light, many know. However this (with the Character thou hast given of J. S. and J. W. in the third page of thy Preface) may serve to inform others, who don't see the bottom of your design, to what a towing pitch you, who clamour so against exalting man, can lay up one of your own Party.

Set. 17. Having done with thy Queries, thou now returnest in pag. 48. to thy Observations again with a *Third*; And then thou sayst, *Though I pretend not to know the Occasions whereon the Apostles writ, further than the Scripture manifests; yet I do know how Truth was Preached in the beginning among those, who (through the Power thereof being gathered) were called Quakers, and that many would have undoubtedly fallen, both on the right hand and on the left, should the antient Labourers, after they had been Instruments in the Lords hand to gather Thousands into the Truth, have thus said: We are your Fathers, who in Christ Jesus have begotten you through the Gospel; and we have on that foot a certain Authority in the Power over you, and to command such things as are needful for Order and Unities sake, &c.* Much more thou hast of the same Tenour, too much to be here transcribed; to which I return this answer. As for the Occasions whereon the Apostle writ, there needs no further Scrutiny; the Scriptures sufficiently manifest them. There were certain Men crept into the Church, of whom Jude gives a large Account. These laboured to sow Divisions amongst the Saints, raising and fomenting jealousies, Suspicious, surmises in those that were weak, against their Brethren; and being such themselves as despised Government and spake Evil of dignities, they endeavoured to beget the like in others, stirring them up to murmur and complain against the Apostles and Elders, whom the Holy Ghost had made Over-seers of the flock; Suggesting and insinuating that those design'd to usurp an authority and Power to themselves, and to exercise a kind of Lordship and dominion over others. And this for a while these *Schismatical Spirits* carried on in a close underly way, by *secret whisperings*, back-bittings and slanders against the Apostles and Elders of the Church; whereby they had like to have betrayed many, and drawn them aside from that innocent Simplicity, wherein at first they had received the Truth. Which foul and pernicious practice of theirs did necessitate the Apostles

to assert, and vindicate that authority and Power which they were exercised in, and to shew that it was not an Usurpation, but that God had invested and indued them therewith, for the edification and benefit of the Church of Christ. Hence is it that their Epistles to the Churches are sprinkled with such Terms as these [*I command*, 1 Cor. 7. 10. *We command*, 1 Thess. 3. 4. and again verse 6. *These things command*, 1 Tim. 4. 11. *As we commanded you*, 1 Thess. 4. 11. *This we command you*, 2 Thess. 3. 10. *These things give in charge*, 1 Tim. 5. 7. *Charge them that are rich*, &c. 1 Tim. 6. 17. *Though I might be much bold in Christ to injoyne thee that which is convenient*, Phil. 8. *Having confidence in thy Obedience*, verse 21. *For to this end also did I write, that I might know the proof of you, whether you be obedient in all things*, 2 Cor. 2. 9. *As ye have always obeyed*, Philip. 2. 12. *If any man obey not our words by this Epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed*, 2 Thess. 3. 14.] And hence also it is, that they did so often press and exhort the Believers to Obedience, Submission, Subjection to those that were over them in the Lord, that had the care and oversight of them, that had the Rule over them, &c. Heb. 13. 7. 17. 24. 1 Tim. 5. 17. These were the occasions, William, whereon the Apostles write those passages which thou, and others so much stumble at. And those Occasions of so writing they did not seek, but were (as it were) thrust upon, and (as I may say) compelled to (as Paul speaks of his glorying, 2 Cor. 12. 11.) by those Seducers, who with enticing words and fair Speeches did *lie in wait* to beguile the Simple, being acted by that deceitful Spirit, which under a specious colour of Christian liberty, designed to bring in *licentious Libertinism*, and under pretence of standing against Imposition and usurpation (which they as cunningly as falsely did insinuate the Apostles were setting up) would have subverted the Government of the Church, and reduced all to Anarchy and confusion. But this Spirit then, with those that were acted by it and Active for it, the Apostles opposed in the power of God: and thou mayest read what became of some of them, and whether they ran, even into a Separation, being sensual and not having the Spirit, in Jude Testimonies of them. And plainly, William, in the Characters and Descriptions which the Holy Ghost, in the Scriptures of Truth, hath given of them. Thou and some of thy Abettor,

may read your own states, and see yourselves drawn as to the life: for the *same Spirit* now worketh in some of you, much what after the *same manner*, as it did in them then. And therefore, the *same Occasion* being now given by you, as then was by those disturbers of the Churches peace; and he unto whom all power is given in Heaven and in Earth (who is and will be with his Church unto the end of the world, *Mat. 28. 19, 20.*) having now, as well as then, given Gifts unto Men, indued many with Power from on high, and invested some more especially (upon whom the care of the Churches of Christ doth more immediately fall) with an heavenly Authority in the Truth, for the edification and preservation of the Body, there is the *same reason* and ground for such now to assert and vindicate the Authority and Power which God hath placed in his Church, as there was for them then. And this being done by the *same Spirit*, and in the *same manner* now, as it was then, thou canst *squirt no filth* upon these now which will not tend to bespittle them. Take notice of that *William*, and consider it well, that all thy *Revilings* and Evil speeches against Friends in this day, do reflect as much upon the Apostles and Elders of the Primitive Church, as upon Friends now. And whereas thou fanciest, that if the *antient Labourers in the Gospel*, after they had been *Instrumental in the Lord's hand to gather Thousands into the truth*, should have said what thou, according to the working of thy own imagination, hast invented for them to have said, many would have fallen, &c. I answer, 1. That what thou hast thus conceived, and as thou hast worded it, was never so exprest by Friends in Truth, nor is so exprest in the Scriptures of Truth. But if thou hadst fairly collected what the Apostles have written on this Subject, thou wouldest then have seen, either that thou hast represented Friends more weak and wavering, capricious and brittle than those to whom the Apostles writ; or else that thou art out in thy conjecture of their falling so easily as thou imaginest. The Apostles Epistles were written (by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and in the motion of the heavenly power) to strengthen, to confirm and to establish the Churches, not to weaken, to shake or cause them to fall: and yet (as I have shewed) it is in these very Epistles that those Expressions are found, which thou dost so shrille and art offended at. Dost thou think those Expressions in the Apostles Epistles (which I have

have before enumerated) did cause many to fall then? If not, why shouldst thou apprehend the *same* words from the *same* Spirit, upon the *same* occasion and to the *same* end, should have a *worse* Effect now? Besides, thou mayest consider, that in the beginning (as thou speakest) there was not that occasion for Friends to urge those Scriptures which Treat of this Subject, before thou and some others had endeavoured to con up the minds of some Friends, and to beget groundless jealousies, evil surmises, and mischievous Suspensions in them against their Brethren; as at the first gathering and planting of the Primitive Churches, while the believers were all of one heart and mind, and abode in the Simplicity of the Gospel, in the love that *think no evil* so zealously affected to the Truth, and to the Publishers of it, as the Apostle intimates, Gal. 4. 15. there was no cause for the Apostles so to write as they afterwards did, when such ungodly Men, as Jude speaks of, had crept in, and bewitched them from the Obedience of the Truth, Gal. 3. 1.

Self. 18. The other part of thy observation, wherein thou sayest, *Iet I do know how Truth was preached in the beginning, &c.* I should not have taken notice of, had I not observed in several place of thy Book how conceitedly thou dost lift up thy self to the very dawning (as it were) of the day, as if thou hadst been one of the *very first* that received Truth, and depressed R. B. as low as thou canst, as if he were but a mere novice, one of but yesterday, and knew nothing. Of this thy Book affords variety of instances of either kind; as (with respect to thy self) in Preface, pag. 37, 38. where speaking of the beginning of the latter day of the manifestation of light, thou sayst, I will remember the voice was on this wise, &c. So in 3 part pag. 70. thou sayest, *I do know, having been a witness of the Primitive gathering, &c.* Again, in 4th Part, pag. 86. thou sayest, *Many ancient Brethren BLESSED BE NOT SELF, account this, &c.* More of this kind is in 1 part pag. 14 in 3 part pag. 42. and in 4th part, pag. 95. But of R. B. speaking of the Labours of Friends in the beginning, 3 part pag. 43. thou sayst, *He knows no other than his report, &c.* And in pag. 46. speaking of R. B. thou sayst, *He tells us in Reader whom delivered in the beginning, &c. neither do I know how he well could, unless by report from others, &c.* Now scally William, this exalting thy self,

and *debasing* another, doth not methinks, at all become thee: For though I am far from equalling the dates of your Convince-ments, as not doubting but thou wert called *some minutes* before him; yet I must confess I am greatly inclined to think thou hast no other way to know what was deliver'd in the *beginning*, than the very *same* thou art pleas'd to allow him to have, to wit, Report. For though thou very confidently affirmest here, *Thou dost know how Truth was preach'd in the beginning*, and no less insultingly sayest in the next pag. *Since R. B's age would not admit him as a sufficient and sensible witness thereof; I shall therefore take the pains to do it for him:* yet give me leave, *William*, to tell thee, I question whether thou thy self art a sensible and ear-witness how Truth was preach'd in the *beginning* amongst those who were called *Quakers*. And yet, *William*, I have heard, (for I cannot boast of such Antiquity.) that Friends were called *Children of Light* in the *beginning* (and I think I have read so too in thy Book, and thy self reckoned as one then amongst them, 1 part pag. 3.) before they were called *Quakers*. So that if thou wilt pretend to know what was preach'd in the *beginning*, thou must climb a step beyond the name *Quakers*. All which considered, I do not see how thou canst make it good plainly and according to Truth that thou knowest how Truth was preach'd in the *beginning* other ways than R. B. may know as well as thou: for what thou objectest against him, *viz.* That his age would not admit him as a sufficient and sensible Witness, &c. may by retortion be objected against thee also thus, That thy age, with respect to the date of thy conviction, will not admit thee as a sufficient and sensible witness of what was deliver'd in the *beginning*, but thou must take it by report, as well as he and others.

But since thou art so very *Officious* to R. B. as to take the pains *unask'd* to do that for him; which he was as well able to do as thy self, namely to tell the Reader what were the *Doctrines* that were deliver'd in the *beginning*; it will not be amiss to take notice of them that the Reader may Judge whether the same be not deliver'd still. *The Doctrines deliver'd in the beginning*, thou sayst pag. 49. were chiefly these and such like, *viz.* [That a measure of Christ's light and grace of God was given to every man to profit withal, that this Grace was sufficient, that that which may be known of God, was manifested in us, that the Scriptures

were

were not the Rule but the Spirit; that that which was not of Faith was sin; that we should draw water out of our own Wells; let it be your own and not anothers; that we should not boast in other mens Lines of things made ready to our hands; But since every one must give account for himself, we should see for our selves, believe for our selves, and savour for our selves, and not pin our Faiths on the Sleeves of any, lest we should become Will-Worshippers.] These are the chief Doctrines thou sayst, were delivered in the beginning: Yet I observe, that, though the second Part of thy Book was designed to treat of Doctrines, and was pretended to be written to revive a Testimony to the Principles of Truth antiently held forth amongst the People called Quakers, yet unless it be a few touches concerning the Light, not any one of the Particulars thou hast here delivered as the chief Primitive Doctrines, are there at all mentioned. There thou treatest of *Disallibity*, of *Perfection*, of *Wisdom* and *Knowledge*, of *Magistracy*, &c. Of *Respect of Persons*, plain Language, &c. Of *Swearing*, of *Tithes*, of *Baptism*, of the *Supper*, &c. Of *Justification* and *Sanctification*, and spendest a matter of 60 pages upon them. Now is it not strange that thou shouldst write a Treatise on purpose to revive a Testimony to the Principles of Truth antiently held forth, and leave out all these particulars, which thou sayst are the chief Doctrines delivered in the beginning? How came it thou didst not treat of these there; or reckon those here? But taking it as it is, I demand of thee which of these particulars thou hast here enumerated is now denyed; or not Preached? If these are Preached still, as they were in the beginning, where then is the change? where's the *Innovation*? Name one if thou canst, of those thou Opposest; that pins his Faith upon any mans Sleeve. It is manifest that some that were of thy Party, did pin their Faith on some of your Sleeves, when they Subscribed that Paper for Separation, to which such a multitude of Hands (no less than 87.) were by one Art or other obtained. But it hath pleased God to shew many of them their Error, and give them Repentance unto the acknowledgment of their Fault. *And* *setteth* 19. But though thou canst not deny but that the same Doctrines are still held and Preach'd by Friends, which were delivered in the beginning, yet in pag. 50. thou hast a slander to sling at Friends: For by way of reflection on them, thou sayst,

sayst; But now there are a sort of Innovators, given to change, who introduce such Sayings and Doctrines as these are: Who are these Innovators, William? for it is fit they should be known. Thou that blamest R. B. in one page, for leaving his Reader ignorant, what sort of persons they are he hints at, wouldst thou in the very next page do the same? what else is this but to condemn thy self?

One of the Doctrines thou sayest is introduced, by the Innovators thou dreamst of, is, *That this Light will undo all, or at least, a pretence to the Light; which (sayest thou pag. 50) I can not account sound Language, if Paul's Testimony, Phil. 1. 15, 18, was sound; who said, Some Preach Christ of Envy and Strife? what then, Notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence, or in Truth Christ is Preached, and I therein rejoyce, yea, and will rejoyce.* It seems thou art as uncertain of the Doctrine which thou sayest is introduced, as thou art Ignorant who introduced it. *This Light (thou sayest) will undo all, or at least, a pretence to the Light.* There's some difference sure between the Light and a pretence to it. Therefore I put thee to it, William, to ascertain which of these sayings is introduced, and by whom; which till thou dost, think it not hard if *thou thy self* beest reputed not only the Introducer, but Author of these Sayings: For certainly, if thou hadst heard this spoken by any one, thou couldst have told whether he said, *The Light will undo all, or a pretence to the Light will undo all.* And if the words had been, [*This Light will undo all*] there had been no ground for thee to have added, [*Or at least a pretence to it:*] If the words had been, [*A pretence to the Light will undo all,*] it argues a false and very unworthy mind in thee, from thence to suggest that some body said, [*This Light will undo all.*] But it seems, if any should say, *A pretence to the Light will undo all,* thou couldst not account that sound Language. Pray what dost thou understand by the word [*Pretence*] in this Sense? I take it to signify *a false cover*, by or under which any one *hides his real intent*, and that with a design to deceive: *An appearance in stead of what is not real in Substance; a deceitful colour without sincerity.* Now if this be the right meaning of the word [*Pretence*] then to pretend to the Light, is to make a shew as if one did walk in the Light, when one does not, on purpose to deceive others: And will not such a pretence undo all that useth it? If that will not, what will?

For

For greater dissimulation and more horrible Hypocritical man is hardly capable of. But I perceive that which hinders thee from accounting this sound Language, is thy misunderstanding the words of Paul to the *Philippians*: For thou sayst, *I cannot account this sound Language, if Pauls Testimony, Phil. 1. 15, 18. was sound; who said, Some Preach Christ of Envy and Strife; what then? Notwithstanding every way, whether in Pretence, or in Truth, Christ is Preached, and I therein rejoyce, yea and will rejoyce.* Well, *William*, Paul's Testimony was sound, and so may the other too, for all that; for there's no inconsistency between them. Those false Teachers Paul speaks of did Preach Christ of Envy, though they pretended to do it of love and zeal. So that there the Pretence did not relate to the matter, but the manner; not to the Act of Preaching Christ, but to the end and design they had in Preaching Christ. Whereas in the other case of pretending to walk in the Light, the Pretence relates to the matter and Act it self. These pretend to walk in the Light, yet do not walk in it: But those whom Paul speaks of, did not pretend to Preach Christ, and yet not Preach him (for they did Preach him; the Text is positive, *Christ is Preached*) but they pretended to be moved and drawn thereunto by love and zeal for Christ, when as indeed it was nothing so, but they were thrust on and prick'd forward by Envy, Contention and Strife against the Apostle, *thinking to add affliction to his Bonds*, ver. 16. So that the Apostle rejoyced in that that was real, namely that Christ was Preached: But in their false pretences of love and zeal to cover their Envy, Strife and Contention, it cannot be thought he did rejoyce. But it is highly probable, that such their Hypocritical dissembling pretence did undo them (as the like will undo all that use and persist in it) notwithstanding their Preaching Christ, considering what Christ himself said of such, *Mat. 7. 22, 23.*

Another Doctrine which thou sayest is introduced by the Innovators thou speakest of, is this, pag. 32, *That to pretend want of clearness in sight, will not excuse any from disobedience to God, who submit not to the Sentence of an Assembly for some or other of them) which may in any tolerable supposition be termed the Church of Christ.* This thou seemest to have taken out of R. B's Book, but (as thy manner is) unfairly enough. For thou takest no notice, that R. B. concludes the Sentence or Judgment men-

mentioned, to be certainly and unquestionably given forth by the Spirit of God to be obeyed. And it being so, this is no Innovation, no *new* or *strange* Doctrine: For though man by continued negligence and carelessness, by disobedience and stubborn opposition to the Spirit of God, may so *close the Eye* that God had opened in him, so harden his heart and stupify his Spiritual Senses as not to see, perceive or understand the mind and requirings of the Lord, and in that state is altogether incapable of yielding acceptable obedience; yet shall not all his winking serve his turn: Nay his want of sight, occasioned by his own negligence, carelessness, and disobedience, will be so far from excusing him from disobedience to God, in not answering what God requires of him, that it will aggravate his Offence, and make his guilt the greater. This flows so naturally from that Doctrine which thou saidst but even now was delivered in the beginning, (*viz. That a sufficient measure of the Grace of God was given to every man to profit withal*) that while that is acknowledged to be Antient, it is absurd to repute this New.

Thou hast yet another sting, at I know not whom, in this page. Thou sayst, *There are at this day, who seem to make no distinction between such as would have no Iniquity reprov'd, and those who Conscientiously Scruple to submit to the Dictates of others, till their understandings are illuminated.* Who are these, *William*, thou thus complaineest of? Not the 66 Subscribers of the Testimony given forth from *Ellis Hooks* his Chamber: For your selves acknowledge, (in your 2 Part, pag. 75.) that they say, [*By that Salt that they have in themselves from the Lord, they are enabled to labour, between the Transformation of the Enemy, and the Scruples of the Innocent; and as to be tender of one, so to give Judgment against the other.*] And you blame them for so saying. But, *William*, this looks like another of thy Slanders, which with a liberal hand thou Scatterest abroad at all adventure, not knowing where to fix them. For my part, I declare I know no such among us, nor do believe thou canst find any such, unless among thy own Party. That your selves are such as would have no Iniquity reprov'd, you would almost make a man believe whether he would or no, by publishing with great approbation a Paper in the first Part of your Book, wherein it is laid, pag. 82. *I am constrained by the Spirit of endless*

less love to warn you all, that you may forbear judging of any man any more, upon any pretence whatsoever. Now how dost thou think Iniquity should be reprov'd, if no man must be judged upon any pretence whatsoever? Yet this Paper you magnifie at an high rate, ascribing it to the Spirit of the Lord, not only in the Title-page of your second Part, but for the more Credit of the matter, repeating it also pag. 84.

As to the other part, which speaks of *submitting to the Dictates of others, before their understandings are illuminated*: I observe, that not only here in pag. 51. but in a multitude of places throughout thy Book, thou cryest against *blind Obedience, blind Sacrifices, acting without Sight, without Clearness, before Convincement, though they see it not, &c.* And with great plenty of words and Copiousness of Expression thou variest this Theam. All which I take to be a *malicious design* to insinuate that some Friends do pers others to act, perform, do what they are not convinced of, and do not see. To Answer this in every place where I find intimations of it in thy Book, were to Answer it almost in every other Leaf, so much does thy Book abound with it. Here therefore once for all I reject it and deny it, and cast it back upon thy self as an infamous, false and slanderous Suggestion. And because thy Peek in this part seems more particularly against R. B. I will give thee a short yet full and plain Testimony out of R. B's own writing (as in thy Book I find it) against what thou suggestest, whereby the baleness of thy dealing with him will the more evidently appear. His words are these (in pag. 109. of thy 3 Part.) *I am far from believing, that the most exact conformity to the Order and method of the Church in the Apostles days, or even to what may be now appointed by the same Spirit, without the inward life and vertue go along, signifies any thing; for I know that nothing done by meer imitation will any thing avail in the Worship and Service of God: And therefore that no act done without Conviction will any ways be profitable to the doer.* What could have been said more plain, more express by him, to clear this point and shut out all exception? And what could have been *done* more base and unworthy by thee, than to publish so many foul as well as false suggestions against him in this Case, after thou hadst had this plain Testimony from himself to the contrary? This shews a pre-meditated design and resolved will to abuse him.

Sect. 20. Nor hath he any better dealing from thee in pag. 54, 55, 56, and 57. where thou takest occasion to quarrel with him about the *Terms that have drawn us together, and bond by which we became center'd into one body, &c.* (which I take to be thy fourth Head) in which that thou mayest the more misrepresent him, thou dost both *mis-recite his words*, and *pervert his Sense*. Thou givest his words in pag. 21. Thus R. B. tells us, *That Principles and Doctrines believed through the force of Truth on the Understanding, and practices necessarily depending thereon, are the terms that have drawn us together, and the very bond by which we became center'd into one body and fellowship, or are linked to the body, and the Cause that gathered us.* In pag. 54 reciting the same Passage, thou ferrest it down thus, *That we being gathered together into the belief of certain Principles and Doctrines (through the force of Truth on our understandings) and practices necessarily depending upon them; these are as it were the terms, that have drawn us together, and bond by which we become center'd into one body and fellowship.* Here thou hast given two Quotations of one Passage, differing each from other, and both differing from R. B's Book, out of which thou pretendest to take them. For he grounds the belief of those Principles and Doctrines *not only* upon the force of Truth on the understanding (as thou makest him to do) *but also* expressly on the *Power and influence of Truth upon our hearts*, (which words thou hast left out) and in pag. 29, 30. He saith, *The Doctrines and fundamental Principles of the Christian Faith, we own and believe originally and principally, because they are the Truths of God, whereunto the Spirit of God in our hearts hath constrained our understandings to obey and submit.* And in pag. 34. he saith, *We being a People gathered together by the Power of God into the belief of certain Principles and Doctrines, &c.* Which shews he did not mean a belief of Principles *only* through the force of Truth on the understanding (as thou wouldst have it taken) but through the power and influence of Truth upon the heart, through the operation of the Spirit and Power of God there. And as for his Sense in this Case, It is evident he mentioned Principles, &c. as the *outward bond*, as that by which (as his own words are both in pag. 48, and 34.) we are distinguished from others: For in the same 48 page he says (as thou in one place acknowledgest) *Yet this is not so the bond, but that*

we have a *second* more inward and invisible, to wit, the *Life of Righteousness*, &c. *May* pag. 40. he saith expressly, *This is as an outward Bond*, &c. and pag. 61. he calls the Spirit of God the Bond that links together. This one would think had been enough to have secured him against thy Cavils, *William*, and yet thou knowest this is not all. For in thy Letter Printed in the latter end of this third Part (which gives some account of the Discourse that passed between R. B. and thy self upon this Subject in a Meeting of Friends at London in the 4. Month 77.) it is thus written, pag. 126. And on a debate thereof he acknowledged, that his meaning was not that they were the Original Bond, but rather as fruits and branches of that Bond, and so in that respect might be as an *OUTWARD* Bond, whereby we are united in an Heavenly Society. Nor is this all yet; for in that explanatory Postscript which, at that Meeting, R. B. was desired, in Christian Condescension to the capacities of the weak, to write (and which in this third Part thou hast now Printed) he says expressly, pag. 107. I understood it only of an *OUTWARD* bond, &c. And pag. 108. How much I value that inward Bond, (viz. the Life of Righteousness) beyond the *OUTWARD*, and that I esteem the outward not at all to be valued, but as it comes from the Inward, may be seen throughout all I have written in my Apology and elsewhere. And my affirming, that any denying of any of Truths Principles and Doctrines, is a ground of disowning; was only in respect, that who do so, do manifestly thence make it appear, they have broken the inward Bond first; from which the outward did naturally spring and arise. So that its manifest his sense and meaning herein was no other than thou confessest thy own to be; for thou sayest, pag. 21. and 56. The Spirit is the Bond; And he says pag. 61. of his Book, The Spirit is the Bond that links together. Thou sayest, pag. 21. Principles, &c. in the best sense are but the fruit of the Bond. Again, pag. 55. I do confess that certain Principles, Doctrines and Practices, held and professed in a pious mind, are the fruit and off-spring of that which is the Bond. He says, (as thou acknowledgest pag. 126.) That his meaning was not that they were the Original Bond, but rather as fruits and branches of that Bond. Now for thee, *William*, after all this, when thou hadst had so plain a manifestation, so positive a Declaration of R. B. meaning in the foregoing words, and that not only from his Book, but from his own mouth also, nay when he had so nakedly signified his mean-

ing and sense therein to be *the same and no other* than thou confellest thy own to be; for thee, I say, thus to mis-represent him, and that in Print to the World; to put a meaning on his words which thou knewest was not his meaning, and spend several pages (as thou hast done) in confutation of that forged meaning, what wretched dealing is this? Is this to write upon a *concern of Conscience*, as thou often sayst thou dost? Ah, *William*, learn to deal fairly, at least honestly, in thy managing of Controversy, especially of this kind, else never talk of nor pretend to Conscience.

But in *pag. 55.* thou sayst, *My place now is to detect the Impertinency of R. B's Reason, &c.* And in order thereto, thou sayest, *pag. 56. I may truly say, that in the Primitive days, there were many Believers, who are found in opposite Faiths and practices; witness those who Circumcised, kept a day and abstained from Flesh; and others there were who believed and practised quite otherwise; and yet we do not find that the Bond which centered them into the Heavenly Fellowship of Christs body was broken: But William,* were they gathered into those opposite Faiths (as thou callest them) and practises by the force of Truth upon their understandings, and its power and influence upon their hearts? Or were those who circumcised, kept a day and abstained from Flesh, drawn into or held in the practice of those things through their weakness (see *1 Part, pag. 26.* and *3 Part, pag. 75*) and want of a right understanding; not then feeling the force of Truth in those Cases upon their understandings, nor its power and influence upon their hearts? Nay, were those (thou callest) opposite Faiths and practices the Fruit of the Bond (as thou acknowledgest those were which R. B. speaks of) did the Spirit of God bring forth opposite Faiths and Practices in the Believers? What opposite work hast thou made here? Is not this (to use thy own Phrase, *pag. 47.*) *one of the Brats of Babylon, Confusion and Disorder*? Was this the best way thou couldst find to detect the Impertinency of R. B's reason, which thou saidst was thy place to do? Thou hast greatly mistaken thy place sure.

Again in *pag. 56.* speaking of some *whose integrity might lead them to die for truth*, thou sayst, *Should they be questioned by any one, What are those Principles, Doctrines and Practises you hold, which were the Very terms by which you came to be centred in to Christs body, and which were the Cause that gathered you?* (for

so, sayst thou, are his words, pag. 47. relating to Principles and Doctrines: They would be ready thus to say, &c. Here I observe, thou art very positive R. B's words are, that Principles, Doctrines and Practices are the very terms by which we came to be centered into Christ's body: And yet thou certainly knowest they are not his words, but that thou hast falsified them to serve thy end. For thou thy self hast delivered the same passage in other words, and after another manner, pag. 54. Nay I observe that in four several places, where thou hast pretended to recite this Passage out of R's B. Book, thou hast delivered it four several ways, every one differing from the other, and all four differing from R. B's Book; so regardless art thou of doing right.

But let us now see what answer thou hast provided, for those whose integrity (than sayest) might lead them to die for Truth, if the question thou hast framed should be put to them. They would be ready, thou sayst, thus to say, *What blind questions dost thou bring forth in thy carnal sensual reasoning? 'Twas God's power and Spirit gathered us, &c.* It may be indeed they might have been ready to give such an Answer, had they been as great Proficients in Hicky his way of Dialoguing as thou seemest to be. But then it is no way likely they should be such whose integrity might lead them to die for truth, but rather such as, like thy self, were through envy become dead to the life of truth, though they had been once gathered by the Spirit and power of God. But William, didst thou indeed fetch the former part of this Answer out of Hicky his Dialogues, for 'tis so like him as if it had been spit out of his mouth. As for the other words, that it was God's power and Spirit gathered us, that thou mightest learn from R. B's Book, pag. 34. where he expressly sayst, *we were gathered by the power of God.*

Thou hast yet another touch upon this string, in pag. 57. where thou sayest, *As for thy saying a belief in certain Principles, Doctrines, and Practices necessarily depending on them, are the terms and very bond by which we bee time centered into one body, and the Cause that gathered us; this is not only wrong in it self, (though as is said before, they may be the fruit of the bond) but exactly like the false Churches in the world.* This is false, for as an outward Bond (which R. B. expressly calls it) choam, thou wilt take no notice of it) it is not wrong in it self, nor exactly like the false Churches

Churches in the world. Are the Principles, Doctrines and Practices of the false Churches in the world, the Principles, Doctrines and Practice of Truth? Have the false Churches in the world been gathered into the Principles, Doctrines and Practices which they are in, by the force of truth upon their Understanding, and its power and influence upon their hearts? If thou thinkest so, call them no more false Churches, nor ever condemn their Principles, Doctrines or Practices more: If thou thinkest otherwise, for shame condemn thy self, for bringing such an unpertinent Comparison to detect, as thou pretendest, the impertinency of R. B.'s Reason.

Sect. 21. The next thing, William, I take notice of in thy Book, is a foul Clash between thy Saviour and thy Charity. Thou sayest of R. B. pag. 59. *Therefore I cannot but say, that the scope and bent of his Spirit, so far as from his words I can savour, in relation to this Matter, are not agreeable to the Truth and sound Doctrine.* In pag. 61. thou sayest, *That which R. B. in these things seems to drive at, hath (as to me appears) a plain tendency to draw from the measure of Truth in our selves, though I dare not be so uncharitable as to conclude he so intends; and if any line hath drop from my Pen which may seem to import so much, I declare that not to be my meaning.* Either now thy Saviour is right, and the scope and bent of his Spirit wrong; or the scope and bent of his Spirit is right, and thy Saviour wrong: If thy Saviour was right in pag. 59. what will become of thy charity in pag. 61? If thy charity was right in pag. 61. What will become of thy Saviour in pag. 59? What strange Extremes dost thou run into; judging and boldly censuring in one page the scope and bent of his Spirit as not agreeable to the Truth and sound Doctrine, and yet pretending in the next page but one, that thou dar'st not be so uncharitable as to conclude he intends to draw from the measure of truth in our selves? What else is this but charging in one pag. and retracting in another? And since thou say'st here, *If any line hath drop from my Pen which may seem to import so much, I declare that not to be my meaning;* what must the Reader think of thy saying, *The scope and bent of R. B.'s Spirit, so far as from his words thou canst savour, in relation to this matter, are not agreeable to the truth and sound Doctrine?* Did these lines drop from thy Pen contrary to thy meaning?

'Tis a sign thy self hath left its savour. But if thou dar'st not conclude he intends to draw from the measure of Truth in our selves; how dar'st thou clamour so against him; as in thy Book thou dost; for endeavouring to draw from the measure of Truth in our selves; if it had been uncharitable so to conclude of him, how uncharitable (and worse) is it to clamour against him?

Seit. 22. In pag. 59. entring (as I take it) upon thy fifth Head, thou quarrellest with R. B. (as in other places also of thy Book.) for not describing who are the persons that are the Church, and where those persons do usually assemble in the Church of Christ; and in pag. 60. thou sayest; When we speak of the Church of Christ, we mean visible persons, distinguished outward persons, by names that may be known to the outward man; though I sayst thou art Members of Christ's body distinguished not by such names, &c. This looks like another piece of Confusion. William, is not the Church of Christ the body of Christ, and the body of Christ the Church of Christ? I am sure the Apostle calls it so expressly, Gal. 1. 22. 24. and says so the Church at Corinth, I care the body of Christ; 1. Cor. 12. 27. Princes William, though thou tellest us of Believers in the primitive days that were found in opposite faiths and practices, yet don't go about to make an Opposition between the Church of Christ and the body of Christ. Besides, though true thou sayst the Members of Christ's body are not distinguished by such names as our many persons are; such names as may be known to the outward man; yet in 4th part pag. 70. thou wilt have mortal bodies that are convertible to dust, to be Members of Christ's body. Surely William, mortal bodies, that are convertible to dust, to be Members of Christ's body; Surely William, mortal bodies, that are convertible to dust, are distinguished by such names as outward persons are; such names as may be known to the outward man. How wilt thou reconcile these Opposite Assertions? But one wonder if they might hang no better together for Contradiction and confusion is the natural off-spring of that Spirit by which thou art act'd, of which thou giv'st an instance in this very place; For though blaming R. B. for not describing the true proportion of the Church, thou sayst pag. 19. That though his whole is finite I find

I find not that he hath described who are the persons that are the Church, &c. Yet in pag. 60. thou acknowledgest that he hath described them: for thou sayst, To what end doth the aforesaid Author assign the decision of cases of Conscience to Judges so described, &c. Here thou ownest they were described, though not to thy content: yet in less than half a page before, thou saidst, Through his whole Treatise I find not that he hath described who are the persons, &c. It is a sign thou hast an ill memory.

In pag. 61. Thou sayest, *the Sentence and Judgement of any man or men whatsoever, relating to matters of conscience, ought not at this day to be given forth but by way of recommendation to the Conscience; and so thou saidst before, pag. 21. But in this thou art not sound. Thy Assertion is too large and general, William, and (as thou hast laid it down) is not agreeable to the Truth and sound Doctrine. What if any should bring into the Church damnable Heresies (as the Apostle speaks) hath the Church no power to give sentence or judgment against those Heresies, but by way of recommendation to the Heretick's conscience? Thou hast run thy self into this Error for want of distinguishing between preaching Truth, or sounding the Message of the Gospel, and giving forth a Testimony, sentence or judgment against such as Apostatize from the Truth, or endeavour to make Rents, Divisions and Schismes in the Church. Thou leanest on the word [Recommend] in 2 Cor. 4. 2. But that place will not bear thy meaning, nor warrant thy Assertion. That Instance of the Apostle relates expressly to preaching the Gospel; in delivering which, he recommended himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. But in giving judgment against Apostates, Schismatics and Disturbers of the Church's peace, did he go no further than a Recommendation? I would (said he to the Galatians) they were even cut off which trouble you, Gal. 5. 12. And when he delivered Hymeneus and Alexander to Satan, 1 Tim. 1. 20. that they might learn not to blaspheme, did he not do it by way of recommendation to their Consciences, who had put away good Conscience; and made shipwreck of faith before?*

Thou quotest also the saying of Paul to the Corinthians, thus, *Having hope, that when your faith is increased, we shall be enlarged, by you, according to our Rule abundantly.* And thou sayst

sayst pag. 62. *This doth not manifest Paul's desire was, that they should walk according to his Rule, until their Faith was increased.* No! What Rule should they have walked according to then? His Rule was the Spirit of Life, the Grace of God, the New-Creature; and had they any other Rule? Was not that the common Rule of the whole Church? What other Rule then could they have to walk according to, but the same that he had walked by? But I suppose, *William*, though thou hast used this Text no less than thrice in six Leaves, yet thou hast not considered the scope and occasion of it.

Another of thy mistakes is in pag. 63. when *Paul* reproved *Peter*, *Gal. 2.* Thou sayst, *Peter and those other Jews might have reasoned with Paul, and said, we are the Brethren, and the Church, and our practice ought to be a bond on thee; and thou oughtest rather to submit to us, than we to thee: But had they so done, doubtless (sayst thou) Paul would still have withstood them, and have been justified therein.* And well he might have withstood them: For it is a great mistake, *William*, in thee, to think *Peter* and the *Jews* with him could plead the Power of the Church on their side against *Paul*, when it is manifest *Paul* had the Decree of the Church made at *Jerusalem* in favour of the *Gentiles*, *Acts 15.* to alledge against *Peter*. *Peter* then might well yeild, for *Paul* had the Sentence and Decision of the Church on his side.

Self. 23. Thy next mistake is more gross: For having said that *1 Tim. 1. 19, 20.* is remote from the purpose to which *R. B.* cited it, thou addest these words, pag. 64. *Nay I may reasonably Query, whether this Scripture be (to ordinary capacities) plain to the purpose that Paul himself intends.* Why, *William*, was not this Scripture written by Divine Inspiration, as well as the rest? And did the Holy Ghost Dictate, thinkest thou, or the Holy Apostle write it so obscurely, as not to be plain to the purpose it was intended for? This is a reflection not only upon the Apostle, (which is bad) but upon the Spirit of God too (which is worse:) The inspired Pen-men don't use to write so darkly or defectively, but that what they write is plain to the purpose for which they intend it, and that even to Ordinary Capacities, if it be intended to Ordinary Capacities. And since the same Apostle writes much after the same manner to the Church of

Corinth, in which no doubt there were Ordinary Capacities, as well as Extraordinary; to suggest that what the Apostle to *Wit* was (to Ordinary Capacities) not plain to the purpose for which he did intend it, is to Charge weakness on the Apostle, Insufficiency and defect on the Spirit by which he writ: For what less is implied by such a suggestion, than that the Apostle either did not understand what he intended, or knew not how to express himself intelligibly according to what he intended. But how much soever Ordinary Capacities may be left in the dark, since I am confident thou dost not rank thy self amongst them, I would gladly see whether this Scripture be (to thy Capacity) plain to the purpose that *Paul* himself intends. The Scripture (1 Tim. 1. 19, 20) is this *Holding Fast* and a good Conscience, which some having put away, concerning Faith have made shipwreck; of whom are *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, whom I have delivered to *Satan*, that they may learn not to Blaspheme. Thus saith the Apostle *Paul*: But thou sayst, If we consult the Light, it doth not tell us, that a delivery to *Satan*, may be an expedient whereby to learn not to blaspheme; If by the word *Satan* is meant the Devil; as is usually understood. By the word *Satan*, *William*, is meant the Devil undoubtedly: For in 2 Cor. 2. where the Apostle speaks of the Penitent persons being received into the Church again, (who for his Incest had been delivered unto *Satan*, 1 Cor. 5. 5.) he says, Lest *Satan* should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices, ver. 11, which words are applicable to none but the Devil, who in Scripture is commonly called *Satan*, Mat. 4. 8, 10. Revel. 12. 9. Now it being so, *William*, what Light (or Darkness rather instead of Light) hast thou consulted, that represents this matter so directly contrary to the Apostles plain and express words! Did not the Apostle, thinkest thou, consult the Light, when he delivered those Apostates (*Hymeneus* and *Alexander*) to *Satan*? Did he not consult the Light, when he said he had done this that they might learn not to Blaspheme? And wilt thou pretend by consulting the Light to contradict his Testimony, and say, the Light doth not tell us that a delivery to *Satan* may be an Expedient whereby to learn not to Blaspheme? It's manifest the Light which thou consultest is not the same, but opposite to that, the Apostles saw by. For he saw it expedient to deliver those Blasphemers to *Satan*, that they might learn not to Blaspheme; and he had had experience of the Expedient before upon the

In-

Incessuous Corinthian, who being for his wickedness delivered to Satan, 1 Cor. 5. 5, was thereby brought to repentance and godly sorrow, and so restored to the Church again, 2 Cor. 2. This is matter of Fact, *William*, plain and undeniable: The Incessuous person was delivered to Satan; the end for which he was so delivered was, for the destruction of the flesh, that the Spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus; and so suitable was the Expedient to the End, that by the Expedient the end was obtained, the Flesh was destroyed and the Spirit saved. And why may not such a delivery to Satan be as proper and suitable an Expedient whereby to learn not to Blaspheme, as it was for the destruction of the Flesh, and saving of the Spirit? Thou thinkest perhaps, that because Satan is himself so great a Blaphemer, and Teacher of Blasphemies, the delivering one to him is not the way for such an one to learn not to Blaspheme: But thou mayst consider that Satan is also a great Exalter of himself, and of others too in Pride and Self-conceit; and yet when the Apostle was in danger, through the abundance of Revelations, to be exalted above measure, the Messenger of Satan was sent to buffet him (as an Expedient) lest he should have been exalted above measure, 2 Cor. 12. 7. There is a great difference, *William*, between a mans giving up himself to Satan, to be acted, guided, led, taught by him, and his being Judically delivered by the Church to Satan, or (by being cast out of the Communion of the Faithful, and out of the protection of Christ) exposed to the buffetings and bectments of the wicked one. Such a delivery to Satan, is not as to a Teacher or Master to learn of him; but as to a Rod, a Scourge, an Executioner, to be tormented, and buffeted by him, and through the buffetings to turn to God and learn of him to avoid those Evils, which have brought so great misery upon him. And this good effect which by the delivery to Satan is wrought in the restoration of such an Offender, is not to be attributed to Satan, but to Christ, who in his tender mercy doth suffer Satan to buffet such obstinate and rebellious ones, that they, seeing themselves exposed to the fury of that Roaring Lyon, and defence of all manner of defence or help of themselves, may bow under and submit to the righteous Judgements of God, and thereby they may be restored. *William*, thou consulted the true Light, with thine (and not taken thy own dark Imagination for Light) thou wouldst have

have seen this, and found it plain to the purpose, and wouldst not have run (as thou hast) into a plain opposition to the Apostles words, and to the Spirit of God by which he writ. But what makes thee question whether by the word Satan is meant the Devil? who else dost thou think should be meant but the Devil? To whom else should *he* be delivered, who would not be *subject* to the Power of Christ in his Church, but to him again, from under whose Power he was brought when he was first joyned to the Church? But enough I think is said to expose thy Error, and make it plain (even to the most ordinary Capacity) that thou hast consulted Darkness instead of Light. But since the delivery to Satan is for the destruction of the Flesh, if thou art not willing by Satan to understand the Devil; whom else dost thou take to be meant by that Name? Wouldst thou have an Outward Tormentor, an Outward Executioner to destroy the Outward Flesh? Thou hadst need clear thy self, *William*, that thou art not for Persecution and Outward Force in Religion, which what thou hast here started gives ground to suspect. Therefore it behoves thee to explain thy meaning in this point, and remember I here press thee to it.

Sett. 24. In pag. 65. Thou undertakest to give an Account of the Sentence or Decree given by the Church at *Jerusalem*, *Acts 15.* upon the occasion of some *Judaizers* endeavouring to impose Circumcision upon the Brethren at *Antioch*: But thou art out in almost every part of it. For first thou wouldst make as if the difference lay only between Paul and Barnabas on the one hand, and certain of the *Sett* of the Pharisees on the other. But prithee, *William*, where were the Brethren, the Church of *Antioch*, the mean while? Were they concerned in the difference? One would think they should have been chiefly concerned: For it was they whom those men endeavoured to have brought under the yoke of Circumcision, *ver. 1.* It is true Paul and Barnabas stood by the Brethren, and disputed against those Circumcisers: But it seems, the thing was an Offence to the Brethren: For the Church of *Jerusalem* in the Exordium of their Epistle, take notice that those men had troubled the Brethren, &c. *ver. 24.* and the Joy the Brethren at *Antioch* expressed at the Reading of the Epistle, *ver. 31.* doth manifest the Offence they had conceived against those *Jews*, and how glad they were to be

be delivered from them. So that no question but the difference lay at last as much between the *Gentiles Brethren* at *Antioch* and those *Jews*, as it did between them and *Paul* and *Barnabas*: For the Brethren at *Antioch* and *Paul* and *Barnabas* were of one mind in the matter, and it was on the behalf of the Brethren that *Paul* and *Barnabas* went up to *Jerusalem*.

Next thou sayst, That what the *Apostles* and *Elders* did was by *Assent of differing Parties*, and that this *Assent* is worthy to be noted: So it were indeed if any such *Assent* could be found. Thou affirmest it here, and in 5 *Part*, pag. 74. and elsewhere again; but the Scripture saith nothing of it, the Church at *Jerusalem* don't ground their Decree upon it; what ground then hast thou to surmise it? The Text says, *Certain men which came down from Judea taught the Brethren, and said, except ye be Circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved, Acts 15. 1. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small Dissention and Disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem to the Apostles and Elders about this Question, ver. 2. What [they] were these that thus determined? Paul and Barnabas they could not be; for they were the persons Determined of, not the Determiners; they were the persons Sent, not the Senders. The men that came down from Judea they could not be: For what had they to do to determine that Paul and Barnabas should go? Paul and Barnabas were not at their Command, nor had so much regard for them as to go at their appointment. What [They] then should this be that made this Determination, but the Brethren, the Gentile-Believers at *Antioch*; They that had been grieved, offended, troubled with those *Judea* men: They that had experienced the Love and Faithfulness of *Paul* and *Barnabas* to them, and their willingness to serve them, They determined, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* and certain other of them should go to *Jerusalem*, &c. Certain other of them? Certain other of whom? of them that had thus determined, the Brethren, the Gentile-Believers; and according to this determination they set forward, being brought on their way by the Church, ver. 3. An Argument of love, respect and kindness, which 'tis not likely they would have shewed to those *Judea*-men, that had been so troublesome to them, ver. 24. And as they passed through *Phenice* and *Samaria* they declared the Conversion of the Gentiles, which caused great joy*

joy unto all the Brethren, ver. 3. This those Judea-men could hardly have done, considering the sharpness of their Circumcising Principles, who were positive the Gentiles could not be Saved without Circumcision. And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the Church, and of the Apostles and Elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them, ver. 4. Had those Troublers of the Brethren and Subverters of Souls (as they are called ver. 24.) been amongst them, who (as it appears in the same verse) went out from the Apostles of their own heads, without any Command from them, 'tis like they would have had but a cold Reception of the Church; as on the other hand it could not be expected they should have much to declare of what God had done by them. Thus having traced the Story from the beginning, and gone step by step from the first Rise of the Controversy to the very door (as it were) of that Council or General Meeting at Jerusalem, wherein it was ended, I find no mention of Assent of the differing Parties in this Case. And indeed, as on the one hand it is not very likely that those Troublers of the Church, knowing after what a manner they came away from the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem, ver. 24. would be forward to assent to their determination: So on the other hand, the Church had been in an ill condition, if they could not have given a judgment against and condemned that Doctrine (of the necessity of Circumcising the Gentiles) without the Assent of them that taught it. Yet such an Opinion thou steamest to favour; for

Thirdly, Thou sayst, *The Apostles did not give that decisive Judgment or Sentence, as assuming Authority so to do; saying we are the Church of Christ, and we have power to decide with your Assent, &c.* Though they did not say so in express terms, yet they did say so in effect: For when they began their letter thus, *The Apostles, and Elders, and Brethren send Greeting,* ver. 23. they did in effect say, *The Church of Christ sends Greeting.* Nor can they be understood to mean otherwise, especially if it be considered that instead of *Brethren* here in verse 23. the *whole Church* is put in verse 22. *Then pleased it the Apostles and Elders, with the whole Church to send, &c.* And it's said they were assembled *with one accord*, ver. 25. Now if (as thou fanciest) the difference had been referred, by joyn't consent of the Parties differing, how comes

comes it then that so many were concerned in it to whom there can be no pretence that it was referred: for in ver. 2. where it is said, *They determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them should go up to Jerusalem about this Question,* it is express only unto the *Apostles and Elders*; no mention of the *Brethren* or rest of the Church. But yet when they came to *Jerusalem* the *whole Church* had the hearing of the matter, ver. 4. and 22. and the sentence given was not by the *Apostles and Elders only*, as *Referees*, but by the *Apostles and Elders and Brethren* jointly, as a *Church*. Which shews they proceeded not upon a *legative power* given by the *Parties* differing (for then none ought to have meddled but they to whom such power had been particularly given) but upon a *Chairship power*, a power committed by *Christ* unto his Church. So that though they did not assume themselves an authority, yet they did exercise the authority which *God* had given them, 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. which did not depend upon the *Assent of parties* (especially in cases of this nature: For this was not a matter of outward Property, there was nothing of *Mens and Thins* in this case) but upon the power and pleasure of him that gave it. Therefore they say, ver. 28. *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things.* Without say the *Holy Ghost* had not power to decide without the assent of differing *Parties*. Why, the *Holy Ghost* and the *Church* were in *Conjunction*, in *unity*, they were *one*; and what the *Apostles* and *whole Church* did therein, they did in, by, and with the presence, power, virtue, counsel, guidance and direction of the *Holy Ghost*. And surely if the *Church of Christ*, thus assembled, thus guided, have not power to give positive Sentence and judgment against such as shall bring in *damnable Heresies*, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. *Doth the of Devils*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. or that shall trouble the *Brethren*, and endeavour to *subvert their souls*, as those did, *Acts.* 15. say unto them who are to be sentenced and judged will assent to the sentence or judgment, the *Church of Christ* would be brought into a *conditional* assent, or rather they would assent only to the sentence and judgment of the *Apostles and Elders* do not say that their sentence shall or ought to be obligatorie on all the members of the *Church of Christ*. To wit, they do not speak it in so many words.

words; but they say enough to that purpose, when they say Verse 28. *It seemed Good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden, &c.* This carried obligation enough in it, and extended as far as the occasion required, and we read that *Paul* and his Companions, *as they went through the Cities* in their travels, *delivered unto the Churches the Decrees,* Acts 16. 4. (not out of curiosity to see what was done, but *to keep*, to observe) and whereas thou sayst, It was not obligatory on the *Jews*, I answer it was not intended it should be: For it was directed to the Brethren which were of the *Gentiles* ver. 23. and not only to them in *Antioch* (by whom the Complaint was made) but in *Syria* and *Cilicia* also; and from *Acts* 16. it may be gathered that it was delivered to other Gentile Churches to which it was not particularly and by name directed. And though it was not obligatory on the *Jews*, yet it contained a severe reproof and censure of those *Jews* that had disturbed the peace of the Churches.

Neither dost thou hit the mark in the Reason thou assignest for that Sentence of the Apostles, &c. Which thou sayst was this, *viz. To walk according to the measure received*: For that was not the reason of that sentence, either with respect to what was *laid on* them, or what was *as I may say, taken off*, or rather) not laid on them thereby. For if it be supposed that in not injoyning *Circumcision* and other legal Rites, regard had been had to the measure of light and grace which the Gentile Believers had received, the inference will be, that because those Gentile Believers were *weak in the faith*, and had received but a small measure, therefore *Circumcision* was *not yet* laid on them, but forborn till they had received a greater measure, and attained a greater growth, which to suppose would be extremely *fool* and *absurd*: for the greater measure they received, and the higher growth they attained in the life of Christianity, the *further off* were they and more remote from *Circumcision* and legal Ceremonies. Nor will the Inference be fairer on the other hand, with respect to what was *injoyned*: for supposing those things, mentioned in the Decree, were laid on the Gentile Believers, with respect to the measure of light and grace which they had received, what else will the inference be, but that because their measure was little, their growth small, their attainment but low in the Truth, therefore they should

should abstain from Fornication, &c. as if when they came to receive a greater measure, and attain an higher growth in Truth, they might then return to Fornication again; which but to imagin, were horrible impiety. Yet such inferences, *William*, will be unavoidably thine whilst thou makest the reason of the Church's giving that sentence to the Gentile Believers to be, That they might walk according to the measure they had received. But these inconveniences thou hast run thyself into, *William*, by meddling in things without thy line, and labouring (as thou sayst of others, pag. 47.) in things which it seems thou understandest not. For though it be necessary for every man to be fully persuaded in his own mind (and no doubt the Gentile-Believers were so after they had received the Decrees of the holy Ghost and the Church, *Acts* 15. 31. though they were in the doubt and questioning before, ver. 2. until those Decrees had established them, *Acts* 16. 4.) yet if thou hadst considered the Occasion of this sentence, and the different natures of the things contained in it, thou wouldest not I think have given that for the reason of the sentence which thou hast [to wit, to walk according to the measure received] but have seen, That the moral Evil of Fornication was reason enough for the Church to forbid it, and that a Christian condescension to the present weakness of their Jewish-Brethren, was a sufficient reason for injoyning them to abstain from things offered to Idols, Strangled and Blood, which to the Jewish Believers were a matter of very great scandal and offence. And whereas thou sayst, pag. 66. As to the Gentiles it doth plainly appear, that the decisive judgment of the Apostles, &c. with respect to that controversy, touching Circumcision, was not a bond upon them, contrary, but according to their faith, &c. I answer Circumcision, is not a part of, nor contained in the Judgment which the Apostles, &c. sent to the Gentile-Brethren. For though probably it might at first be the chief part of the Controversy, yet in the Sentence it is omitted, and not so much as named by the Apostles, &c. who well knew that the not injoyning it was sufficient. The Question therefore will not be whether what was not in the Sentence was according to their belief, but whether all that was in it was according to the Gentiles Faith. Was abstaining from blood and things strangled according to the Gentiles Faith? Surely if it were, if they had believed it their duty so to abstain, they would have

abstained from them before this Decree was made; and then what cause would there have been for inserting those things in the Decree? Did the *Gentiles* in abstaining from Blood, &c. walk according to the measure they had received, or according to the measure their *Jewish-Brethren* had received? Was it because of their own weakness, or the weakness of the *Jewish* Believers? Surely, *William*, if thou considerest well, thou wilt find, that in this their condescension to the weakness of their Brethren (who, being but newly come from under the *Jewish* Pedagogy, were too tenacious of the Ceremonial Law) these Gentile-Believers did rather walk according to the measure of others than their own. For had not the *Jews* through weakness sinned in these things, 'tis more than probable the *Gentiles* had never been in-joyed by them; especially if we consider how *Paul* elsewhere writes to the *Gentiles* about things offered to Idols, 1 Cor. 10. 27, 28, 29. I have been somewhat long I confess herein: But thy manifold Errors in this part have occasioned it. But I shall hasten the faster through what remains.

Señ. 25. Thou hast not done quarrelling about the Authority of the Church, which thou wouldst fain have laid aside. Thou sayst, pag. 66. Moreover when I consider how innumerable Controversies have arisen touching the Authority of the Church, and the Decrees that have been brought forth touching matters of Conscience, under the notion of the Church of Christ in Ages past; and that the like Controversies may in probability arise at this day, should any number of persons whatsoever assemble, and not only say, we are the Church of Christ, but also thus, we have Power to bind and loose; and upon that foot give forth positive Sentences, &c. I cannot but query, where lies the Service to God, and his Truth, for any to concern themselves to treat on such Subjects, &c. To this I say, because Controversies have arisen touching the Authority of the Church, in the night of Apostacy, amongst them that were out of Truth; doth it therefore follow that the Church of Christ hath no Authority? Or is it evil for her to assert her Authority against Gain-layers and Opposers of her and it? As many Controversies have arisen touching the Church it self (which amongst all the many Churches was the true Church of Christ) as touching the Authority of it. Doth it therefore follow that there is no Church of Christ? or that it is evil, or needless, for Christs

Christs Church to assert and prove that she is the Church of
 Christ? Come, come, *William*, They that have their Eye in
 their head (and not like the Fools in the Corners of the Earth) do
 see a service to God and his Truth, in asserting and vindicating
 the Authority of Christs Church, against that Spirit (of
Abaddon) that would destroy, subvert and lay wast the Church
 it self, as well as it impugns the Authority thereof. And there-
 fore though Friends at their first coming forth (as the Apostles
 at the first Preaching of the Gospel) laid little of the Authority
 of the Church, which none then questioned, yet after the
 Mystery of Iniquity had so wrought and prevailed, as to draw
 some from the Truth, and made use of them to subvert and
 seduce others also, first into a disregard and contempt of the
 Church and her Authority, and then by degrees into an open
 Opposition and War against it, a service was seen by them that
 kept their habitation in the Light (which all such Opposers go
 out of) to be concerned on the behalf of God and his Truth,
 to assert the Authority which God hath given unto his Church
 (as did also the Apostles upon somewhat the like occasions, *1 Cor.*
10. 8. and elsewhere) and to discover and lay open the secret
 wiles and smooth insinuations, whereby the subtle Serpent hath
 wrought, in such Apostates and gain-saying Spirits, with cum-
 ming craftiness to beguile and deceive the simple. And though
 the Apostles (as thou objectest) did not expresse (that we read
 of) the very same words which Christ spake, *Mat. 18. 18.* (and
 thou in part repeatest) *Whatsoever ye bind on Earth, shall be bound*
in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed
in Heaven. Yet that both they, and the Church in their time,
 did exercise the Power thereby committed to them, appears in
 the Case of *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, whom *Paul* delivered to
Satan, *1 Tim. 1. 20.* And in the Case of the Incestuous *Corin-*
thian, upon whom the Church of *Corinth* did exercise the Power
 both of binding and loosing. Of *binding*, when in the Name
 and Power of the Lord Jesus Christ, they did solemnly and ju-
 dicially excommunicate him, *1 Cor. 5.* Of *loosing*, remitting,
 or unbinding, when upon his repentance and godly sorrow,
 they received him into the Church again, *2 Cor. 2.* Nor is it to
 be doubted but the Apostle *Paul* had a direct reference to those
 words of Christ, *Mat. 18. 18.* when to the *Corinthians* he said,
Though I should boast somewhat more of our Authority (which the

Lord hath given us for edification, and not for your destruction) I should not be ashamed, 2 Cor. 10. 8. But *William*, since thou questionest where the service lies to God and Truth, for any to treat on this Subject, which thou seemest to think, pag. 67. may give occasion to receive the weak to doubtful Disputations; let me ask thee, where lies the service of thy concerning thy self to treat of this Subject at the rate thou hast done? What tends it to, or what can be thy drift therein, but to stagger the minds of weak Friends, to *stumble* the young convinced, and turn the feeble out of the right way, by insinuating Queries to *beget doubts* where no Cause of doubt can be? For since thou acknowledgest, that Christ did say, *What you bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven*; what dost thou think he meant? Was he not in earnest, thinkest thou? Did he speak in vain? Or had the Church really and indeed that Power which these words of Christ import? If thou thinkest she had not, speak out that all may see thee: If thou thinkest the Church had really that Authority, to what end then serves thy Insinuation, that neither the Apostles nor the Church ever made use of that Expression to shew their Authority, when as thou canst not deny that they did make use of the Authority, and might no doubt have used the Expression too (if they had seen cause) without offence to any but such Apostates, as like *neither the Expression nor the thing?*

But thy Spirit is savoured, *William*, and thy design discovered. The tendency of thy work is to break the Bond, to dissolve the Unity of the Body, to *set up Factions*, and make Fractions in the Church. For in pag. 64. speaking of those words of Christ, Mat. 18. *If he refuse to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen man*, Thou sayst, *The Scripture doth not say, that Sentence ought to be Obligatory on all other Members of the Church of Christ, who might (thou sayst) be NO WAY CONCERNED either in the admonition or Sentence, to look upon him as an Heathen man; but it saith, Let him be unto [thee] as an Heathen man*. So, so: And what shall he be mean while unto others? Shall he, for refusing to hear the Church, be unto the offended Brother as an Heathen man (and that by Christ's express command) and yet at the same time be owned and received as a Christian, a Brother, a Fellow Member, by other Members of the Church? Shall he that is justly and rightly rejected as an Heathen man by *some* of the Church, be at the same

same time received and owned as a Brother by *others* of the Church! What quarter of Hell didst thou fetch this Doctrine from? Can any thing tend more directly to *divide the Church*, and set one part of it against the other? What readier course could have been invented to shelter an Offender from the just stroke of the Churches Sentence! At this rate, he who, for his obstinate refusing to hear the Church, is justly cast out and disowned by the Church as an Heathen man, may notwithstanding the Churches Sentence, be taken in, received and owned as a very good Christian, a Brother, by those who are of the same Communion with them that cast him out. What greater *Confusion* can thy heart desire, than this would make? But as it is not difficult to discern for whom this shelter was contrived: So it is very apparent even from this Instance also, that thou art a man of a *corrupt* mind, and a very *unsound* Judgement. For thou hast here broached two other *fool* Errors. One is, That the Sentence given by the Church of Christ, according to the command of Christ, against an Offending Brother refusing to hear the Church, is *not obligatory* on all Believers, or *on all the Members of the Church of Christ*. But some Members of the Church of Christ may own and receive him as a Brother, whom the Church of Christ hath justly and rightly disowned and rejected as an Heathen man. This is a *pernicious* Error, destructive of the unity of the Body, and devised by the wicked one, on purpose to divide the Church. Nor could any thing have been delivered more apparently repugnant to the scope of Christs words. Doth he not say, in the very next Verse, *Whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven*, Mat. 18. 18. Is the Churches Sentence so binding, as that whatsoever the Church binds on Earth shall be bound in Heaven: and yet is not the Churches Sentence, though given by the express command of Christ, *Obligatory on all the Members of the Church*? What madness, *William*, hath possessed thy mind!

Thy other Error is, that when the Church of Christ had admonished an offending Brother, and upon his refusing to hear the Church, hath given Sentence against him, as Christ commanded; *Other Members of the Church of Christ may be so* may *conserved either in the Admonition or Sentence*. This also is a *Mischievous* Error, tending to *break the Unity*, to *disunite the Members of the Spiritual Body*, to make the Members not only *inde-*

independent of the Body, but also Independent of the Head Christ Jesus; so as that what the Church doth *as a Church*, what the Body doth *as a Body*, by the direction and express command of the Head, some of the Members of the same Body may be no way concerned in. This tends to stop the common stream of Life; to cut off that Spiritual Intercourse and Communion, which *all* the living Members of the Body have one with another, through the *universal* Spirit; to beget a sluggish, dull, stupid *Insensibility* in some of the Members; of the movings, stirrings, workings, breakings forth of life, from the Head, through the rest of the Members of the Body; to nourish, cherish and indulge a slothful *Carelessness*, a Luke-warm *Indifferency*, a negligent *Unconcernedness* in the work of the Lord, which is a *Cursed* state. The Church of Christ, though consisting of *many* Members, is notwithstanding but *one* Body; and as it hath but *one* Head, so hath it also but *one* Life in which it moves, and *one* Spirit by which it is acted, led and guided. And whatsoever, either Admonition or Sentence, the Church of Christ, thus moved, led and guided, doth give forth, according to the command of Christ, *every* Faithful, Living, Sensible Member will feel himself concerned in: For though every individual Member may not be therein *actually* concerned, as not being all personally present; yet every such Member is *virtually* concern'd; and he that is not at all concerned, or (as thy word is) *no way concerned*, is no true Member of the Church of Christ, is not a partaker of that *one* Life, which flowing from the Head, through *all* the Members, animates the *whole* Body. And such an one thou hast here manifested thy self to be.

Sect. 26. Here like a man starting out of a Dream thou tellest a Story that has no kind of relation at all to the matter thou art upon. Thou sayst, pag. 67. *The Consideration of these things puts me in mind, that there are some, who in their busy minds are apt to be considering, what sort of joyes Heaven yields to the faithful after this life; when as their time would undoubtedly be much better spent, in contemplating how to comethither, &c.* Surely *William*, none of the things that thou hast been treating of could put thee in mind of this. Who I wonder are these, whose minds are apt to be so busy in such consideration? Doft

Dost thou really know any such? or *only fancy* there are such? However, if such there be, 'tis probable they do *contemplate* how to come thither, as well as *consider* what they shall enjoy there. And if contemplation would serve the turn, few would fall short of coming thither. But truly *William*, I wish for thy own sake, thou hadst not spent thy time more in contemplating how to come thither, than in the true travel thitherward. And though thou blamest them that consider what sort of joyes heaven yeilds to the faithful after this life; I think it had been well for thee, if thou hadst timely and thoroughly considered what sort of *Torments* Hell yeilds to the unfaithful, disobedient, rebellious *Apostates* after this life, that by the *terrors* thereof thou mightest have been restrained, from suffering the Dragon through thee to cast forth that *stud. of foul reproaches*, where-with thy Book is filled, against the women that hath brought forth the Man-child, and against the Remnant of her Seed. And O that thou mayst yet consider, and repent, if it be not too late!

But I perceive, *William*, the design of thy bringing in this far-fetcht and foreign story, of some that consider what sort of joys Heaven yeilds after this life, was but to have a sting at R. B. for thou addest, *To this sort may such be likened, who will needs give themselves the trouble, to treat how far Christ's government extends, &c.* This is a string thou hast harped upon before, pag. 28. of this 3 part and 1 part, pag. 47, 48. But surely *William*, thy Comparison will not hold proportion: for the Joyes of heaven which thou speakest of are such, it seems, as are not to be enjoyed till after this life; but the government of Christ in his Church I hope thou wilt admit, is to be known and subjected to *in this life*; and if so, surely then to treat of it, and the extent thereof, and that with respect to particular Cases, cannot be troublesome to any but to such *Libertines*, as Christ's government itself is troublesome and uneasy to; such as would fain cast his Yoak from them, and break his Bonds asunder.

Sett. 27. In pag. 68 Thou hast another Cayll at an Expression of R. B's which thou senest down thus, *Concerning the power of decision* R. B. pag. 66. saith, *The only proper Judge of controversies in the Church, is the Spirit of God, and is not necessarily annexed to any person, or person, or place whatsoever, &c.* That

is to say, that any have ground to reason thus, Because I am or have been such an eminent Member, therefore my judgment is infallible, or because we are the greatest Number, or that we live in such a noted or famous place; though some of these reasons may and ought to have their true weight, in case of contradictory Assertions. On this last Clause thou spendest a carping Query thus, Here (sayst thou) I cannot but Query, that if the Spirit of God be the only proper Judge of controversy in the Church, how then can there be any weight in any other thing else besides the Spirit? I answer, Yes, very well, what should hinder? Though the Spirit of God be the only proper Judge in the Church, yet there is weight in many things besides the Spirit, yea, in all things relating to the kingdom of God and government of Christ Jesus. All the gifts and graces of God, by the Spirit, are weighty, as well as the Spirit it's self; and the Church (on which those gifts and graces are bestowed, and in which the Spirit is the only Judge) is weighty also, and so is every true Member thereof, though thou and thy Query are not.

Thou enlargest thy Query thus, And whether these his words, viz. Some of these Reasons ought to have their true weight, in case of contradictory Assertions (when relative to that which he himself concludes is unalterably seated in the Spirit of God) seem not a contradiction in common sense? I answer, No, not at all: for though the Spirit be the only proper Judge of Controversy in the Church, yet he gives forth his Judgment through some or others Member or Members of the Church, and that usually not the weakest, lowest and youngest in growth and standing in the Truth, but such as are Elder and stronger, whose place notwithstanding and station in the body, though they do not infer a necessity that the Spirit must needs give forth its Judgment through them, yet may they and ought they to have their due weight in case of contradictory Assertions. As where any shall affirm, that the Judgment of the Spirit is rather to be expected and looked for through such Members, as are weakest, lowest and youngest in the Church; there the strength, growth and attainments in the Truth, of such as have been antiently gathered, and made use of by God for the gathering of others, may and ought to have their true weight, and will be found of weight in such cases, and no way contradictory either to common sense, or to R. B's. Asserting that the Spirit is the only proper Judge of

con-

controversy in the Church. And this R. B. hath plainly laid down, fairly argued and fully proved in the 7th Section of his Book, from pag. 66. to pag. 75. And whereasthou askest, in pag. 69. *Why are not the meanest of the flock, the lesser Number, mentioned, and that some of these also may and ought to have their true weight, &c.* I answer, becaule it hath not been the usual and ordinary Method and Course of the Spirit of God to give forth his Judgment in case of controversy in the Church through the meanest (understanding by meanest the *weakest*, lowest, youngest, and least of growth in the Church.) And though thou seemest willing to insinuate such a thing, by alleading that God hath chosen the foolish, weak and vile despised things of the world to confound the wise and mighty; yet thereby thou hast only discovered the unsoundness of thy own mind, and thy Ignorance of the mind of the Spirit in those words: For they whom God had chosen, were the foolish, weak, vile and despised of the world (mark that, *William*,) not of the Church; the Church did not account them so, though the world did (for amongst those whom the world did so despise were the Apostles themselves.) Nor was the end why the Lord chose such, to confound the wise and mighty in the Church (those who were made wise unto Salvation, wise in the wisdom of God, and mighty in the life and power of Jesus) but to confound the wise and mighty of the world, into which out of the Truth thou art gone, despising those whom God hath chosen, and representing them as foolish, weak and vile. But thy work is discovered, and thy Spirit is discerned and Judged not to be the Spirit of truth, which leadeth into Truth, but the Spirit of Error and confusions which hath led thee to err so grossly in a case so plain and obvious.

Sett. 28. In pag. 69. Thou settest down three Propositions, taken (but some what imperfectly) out of the 68. pag. of R. B's Book, and then layst, *Out of these three Assertions may be collected, without the least abuse of the Authors words, this short ensuing Sentence, viz. That a Person's not submitting to the positive judgment touching Controversy, given by any Assembly (or at least by some or other of them) which may in any tolerable Supposition be term'd the Church of Christ, is disobedience to God, though the Persons refusing pretend, they refuse to submit on the account they see it*

not. Besides thy omitting some material words in repeating R. B's Propositions (a thing thou art frequently and foully guilty of) thou hast greatly abused R. B. in the Sentence thou pretendest to collect out of his words. For he makes the Spirit of God the Basis and foundation of his Propositions, which thou leavest wholly out, not so much as naming the Spirit of God at all in thy collected Sentence; yet art not ashamed to say thou collectest it without the least abuse of the Author's words. These Tricks will gain no credit to thy work, William, nor to thee neither. But if thou wouldst have a Sentence collected out of R. B's Propositions, I will collect one for thee thus, That any Persons contradicting, or refusing to submit to a positive Judgment in case of Controversy, given by the Spirit of God through the Church of Christ, will not be excused from being guilty of disobeying God by pretending they see it not. There is a Sentence as short as thine, but more fairly collected; Object what thou canst.

But as one Error in the foundation doth usually occasion more in the building; so thou having collected falsely, from that Collection drawest a false Conclusion: For thou sayest, By this Sort of Language, every one must not only now believe as the Church believes, but also must believe as any Assembly (or some or other of them) doth, which in any tolerable supposition may be termed the Church of Christ, or at least submit to such, though the persons refusing shall pretend they see it not. Whereas even the Sentence thou thyself has collected out of R. B's Propositions doth not say that a person must submit to the Judgment, &c. though he see it not, but that his not submitting is disobedience to God. Which if it be not (where the Judgment given is of God, which it must be if the Spirit of God gives it, as in this case is premised) how safe is he that is spiritually blind to whatsoever he hath not a mind to submit to. He that were then most hard, most dark, would have the odds in that respect of them that see, his want of sight, through willful blindness, excusing and acquitting him from disobedience unto God; though he refuse to submit unto whatsoever God requires. Yet this is the plain consequence of thy Reasoning. William, Thou sayst, pag. 70. He that runs may read a body of darkness and confusion herein. But hold, William, He must not be one of thy Party then, whose defence lies in want of sight, in not seeing. He had need be one that can see, and

and that well too, or else he will never make a good Reader, whether he run or go. But thou art got into such a running strain, William, that thy Pen runs beyond thy understanding, as quick as thou takest thy understanding to be. He that runs, thou sayst, may read a Book of Darkness and confusion herein, what a long step at once, sayst thou, is here from under Christ's Government, that now submission must be to any Assembly, or some or other of them, that in any tolerable supposition may be termed Christ's Church? Nay addest thou, if the want of sight being laid for an excuse, shall not excuse submission, may I not further say, What a long step at once is this to magnify that devotion, whereof Ignorance is the Mother, and that Zeal which is without knowledge? All this high Rant William, is but an empty sound, a mere noise of words, grounded upon a slanderous Suggestion, that Friends would enforce a submission without sight, and that to the judgment of an Assembly, &c. The one part of this is wholly false, the other fallacious: for Friends are so far from pressing submission without sight, that they utterly condemn blind Obedience, and they do not speak of the judgment of an Assembly abstract from or without the Spirit of God, but they speak of the judgment of the Spirit of God himself, given forth through an Assembly that is really his Church, or through some Member or Members thereof. And so speaks R. B. expressly, *How should we*

But as on the one hand such sightless Submission and Blind Obedience is not accepted so on the other hand, such blindness and want of sight will not excuse any from disobedience to God: For their want of sight is their own fault, in not walking in the light, in not attending diligently to the voice of the Spirit in themselves; which if they did, they could not but see and understand what the same Spirit gives forth, with relation to them, through any Member or Members of the Church. For God is not (as the slothful Servant charged him, Luk 19. 20.) an hard Master, requiring what he hath not given Means to perform; but he hath given unto Men such a measure of his light, grace and Spirit, as is sufficient to let them see what God requires of them. So that if his judgment is given forth, through whomsoever, be really of and by the Spirit of God, every one concerned in the judgment, ~~must needs~~ *must needs* fear, if they give diligent attendance to the Spirit of God in themselves. He therefore that in such a case saith I do not see it, doth implicitly say I have

been careless, negligent, disregardful of and disobedient to the Spirit of God in my self: And is not that a fault? How foolish then will they be found who think to excuse one fault by alledging another! to excuse their disobedience to the requirings of the Lord, by pretending they see it not, when their not seeing proceeds from disobedience! The Jews, God's people of old, could not escape so: But God, by his Prophet, tells them, *Therefore will I Number you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter, because when I called ye did not answer* (Why, we did not hear, they might have said, and will not that excuse us? No, no; that was a part of their sin, for which those grievous Judgments were denounced) *When I speak YE DID NOT HEAR*, &c. *Isa. 65. 12.* So likewise, *Jer. 7. 13, 14, 15.* *And Now because ye have done all these works, saith the Lord, and I speak unto you rising up early and speaking, but ye HEARD NOT; and I called you, but ye answered not: therefore will I do unto this house, which is called by my name, wherein ye trust, and to the place which I gave to you and to your Fathers, as I have done to Shiloh: And I will cast you out of my sight, as I have cast out all your Brethren, even the whole seed of Ephraim.* We see here, their not hearing was so far from excusing them for not answering, that it is charged on them as a part of their sin, for which God threatened to cast them out of his sight. And if the Spirit of Truth reproves the world of sin, because they believed not in Christ; *John 16. 8. 9.* how much more will he reprove and condemn those who professing to have received Christ the light, and to believe and walk in him, would yet excuse their disobedience to his requirings, under pretence of want of sight! As therefore Christ said to *Nichodemus*, *John 3. 18.* *He that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God:* So may it be said to such now as pretend they do not see, *He that doth not see that Judgement which is given forth by the Spirit of God, is so far from being excused by not seeing, that he is condemned already for not seeing.* And as the reason of the condemnation to the world is, because light is come into the world, *ver. 10.* which light if the world would receive and obey, they could not chuse but believe: So the condemnation to those that pretend they want sight, is because the light is not only come to them, but they pretend to have received it, which if they did constantly attend unto,

and faithfully obey, they could not chuse but see. Thus I hope it is made appear, that although *blind Obedience is not acceptable*, yet *no man's blindness can excuse him* for disobeying God. For unto God, not unto man, the disobedience is, where any shall refuse to submit to, or contradict the Judgment of the Spirit of God, although that Judgment be given forth through man. Now therefore *William*, stop thy *Career* a while, and instead of *running* and reading, *stand still* and see (if thou hast any light remaining) *What a body of darkness and confusion* (to use thy own words) thou hast endeavoured to introduce; *What a long step at once* thou hast taken from under Christ's Government, that he that will pretend he doth not see, may thereby excuse himself from submitting to that Judgment in case of controversy, which the Spirit of God shall give through the Church of Christ or any Member of it. And whereas thou askest, *Is here any room left to see and savour for our selves?* I say, *Yes*; and such as have not lost their sight and savour, will exercise those senses in the light of Christ and therein will own, receive and submit to the Judgment of the Spirit of God, through what Member soever of the Church it be given. But they that want sight are not like to see our savour either. But *William*, I might rather ask, what room hast thou left for the Government of Christ when a pretence of want of sight shall excuse from submitting to what he requires, to the Judgment he gives by his Spirit in his Church; when disobedience shall be pleaded to take off disobedience and one fault alledged to excuse another?

Self. 20. In pag. 71. Thou sayst, *Let us examine how R. B. proves his first Assertion, viz. That there never will nor can be warring in case of controversy, the Spirit of God to give Judgment, through some or other in the Church of God, so long as any Assembly can properly, or in any tolerable supposition be so termed. His proof, sayst thou, is on this wise, for the first, saith he, To those who believe the Scriptures there will need no other probation, than that of the 28th of Mat. 20. And so I am with you alway, unto the end of the world, and ver. 18. (of Mat. 16. it should have been) And the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. To this thou sayst, How this proves the matter, to me appears not: For these Scriptures do neither expressly nor by any natural consequence say, that any Assembly is the Church of Christ, which may in any tolerable supposition be so termed, nor*

yet speak any thing of Controversies arising amongst the Members of the Church of Christ. I answer, Though it appears not to thee, who it seems wantest sight, yet to any that do see, it may appear plain enough. For though thou wouldest cavil at the words [*tolerable supposition*] which thou dost often quibble about, yet thy Objection has no weight in it: For it is not material whether these Scriptures do express or infer that any Assembly is the Church of Christ, which may in any *tolerable supposition* be so termed, since it is evident that no Assembly can in any *tolerable supposition* be termed the Church of Christ but that which is *really, truly* and indeed the Church of Christ. For if any Assembly that is not the Church of Christ, should be supposed to be the Church of Christ, that *supposition* being *false* is not *tolerable*. So that when R. B. speaks of an Assembly that can in any tolerable Supposition be termed the Church of Christ, he cannot without injustice be supposed to intend any other Assembly, than what is *properly* and *really* in truth and indeed the Church of Christ, since to suppose any other Assembly such, is not *tolerable*. Now then if Christ hath promised to be with his Church alway, even unto the end of the World, I think the proof is plain. And though these Scriptures (as thou sayst) mention nothing of Controversies arising amongst the Members of the Church of Christ, yet if he be *always* with his (as the words is) he cannot be wanting or absent when Controversies arise: nor were it reasonable however to suspect he would, since he himself hath directed that Controversies, though but between Brother and Brother (if not privately composed) shall be brought before, and submitted to the determination and Judgment of the Church. Mat. 18. 17. And since Controversies arising in the Church, are a most likely way (if not composed and removed) for the Gates of Hell to prevail by; to affirm that there ever will or can be wanting in case of Controversy, the Spirit of God to give Judgment through some or other in the Church of Christ, is to admit a possibility that the Gates of Hell may prevail against the Church of Christ, directly contrary to the express words and promise of Christ himself.

By the following words, *William*, discover an unsoundness in thy Judgment. For when thou sayest, *Had he brought the first Scripture to prove, that Christ would be with such whom he at*
this

this day makes use of to teach all Nations (as he did his Disciples at that day) whilst they should teach to observe the things that Christ (to whom all Power is given) commands (not the Commands of Assemblies, which may in any tolerable supposition be termed the Church of Christ, but the things that Christ commands) he had exactly hit the mark, &c. Thou seemest to restrain the promise of Christ's presence to such only as he makes use of to teach all Nations. This looks somewhat strangely, William; yet this is the plain import of thy words: For when thou sayest Had he brought, &c. he had exactly hit the mark; its clear thou acknowledge that as he hath brought this Scripture to prove Christ's presence with his whole Church, as well those that are taught as those that teach, he hath not exactly hit the mark. But if this promise of Christ relates only to publick Teachers, what shall become of them that are taught? Must they have none of Christ's presence? I know not, William, on which hand thou intendedst to place thy self, among the Teachers or the Taught; but I promise thee I and many Thousands more, who have not been made use of to Teach all Nations, are not willing to quit our hold of that divine and comfortable promise. But I hope, William, upon Second Thoughts, thou wilt be of another mind in this case, especially when thou shalt have considered, That the same that said, Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world, said also, Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them, Mat. 28. 20. Two or three is but a small Assembly, and yet such an Assembly so gathered, may properly and in a tolerable (because true) supposition be termed the Church of Christ, and have an Assurance of his presence with them, and that's the reason why the Gates of Hell cannot prevail against them. Well, remember William, this is the Second time thou hast stumbled and stumbled at that Text, Mat. 28. 20. Once while there was no remedy, but all on a sudden the Translation must be altered, and instead of [Unto the end of the world] we must read it [Unto the Consummation of the Age] 2 part pag. 48: as if the promise of Christ's presence had related to that age only, and expired therewith. Now I perceive thou art content in this place to admit the Translation for good [even unto the end of the world] but then we must take it with another Revision, to such as Christ at this day makes use of to teach all Nations, &c. This thou art

art in and out, out and in: still labouring and travelling in the things thou understandest not, and so bring forth (as thy phrase is, pag. 47.) *The Brats of Babylon, Confusion and Disorder.*

Thy Objection against the other Scripture R. B. cited to prove his Proposition, viz. Mat. 16. 18. [*And the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it:*] is nothing else but a meer Cavil; Thou sayst, *Had he brought it to prove, that the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against that Church which is built on the Rock, Christ would have answered the end.* Very well; then the end is answered: For he did bring it to prove that the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church of Christ, which is that Church which is built on the Rock Christ. And having proved that, he thence demonstratively argues, and fairly infers the necessity of Christ's presence with his Church by his Spirit, to give Judgment in cases of Controversy, as that which is absolutely necessary to the preservation of the Church against the Gates of Hell. His words are these, "Now if the Church of Christ were so destitute of the Spirit of God, that in Case of difference there were not any found that by the infallible Spirit could give a certain Judgment, would not then the Gates of Hell prevail against it? for where is strife and Division, and no effectual way to put an end to it, there not only the Gates, but the Courts and inner Chambers of darkness prevail; for where envying and strife is, there is Confusion, and every evil work. To the other part of thy Cavil, wherein thou sayst, *'Tis far remote from proving that God's Spirit will appear to decide Controversies in every Assembly, that in any tolerable Supposition can be termed Christ's Church;* I answer, first That thou hast inverted the order of R. B's words: They are not so in his Book, as thou pretendest to repeat them. He doth not say that God's Spirit will appear to decide Controversies in every Assembly that in any tolerable supposition may be termed Christ's Church. But his words are, "There never will nor can be wanting in case of controversy, the Spirit of God to give Judgment through some or other in the Church of Christ (mark that) so long as any Assembly can properly, or in any tolerable supposition, be so termed. So that with respect to the Spirit's appearing to give Judgment, he says expressly [*the Church of Christ*] and his other words [*so long as any Assembly, &c.*] relate to the state and condition of the Church (which

(which is various) and import no more than, [*So long as Christ hath a Church, how depressed and low so ever its Condition be.*] Nor are those words of his [*That there never will nor can be wanting in case of Controversy, the Spirit of God to give Judgment, &c.*] restrainable to every or any particular Assembly, &c. But indefinitely spoken of the Church of Christ in general: [*Though some or other of the Church of Christ,*] are the words in R. B's Book. But 2dly. I say, That no Assembly can properly or in any tolerable Supposition be termed the Church of Christ, but that which really and truly is so. A false Church cannot in any tolerable Supposition be termed the Church of Christ. It is not tolerable to suppose it. For though the Worlds people, who are out of Truth (and thou, it seems, with them) could be contented with such Suppositions, yet Truth will not tolerate them. These two words [*Tolerable Supposition*] have served thee to play upon a great while, *William*, and thou hast tossed them about sufficiently in this third part of thy Book; I find them in pag. 22, and 23. In 62. thou fallest on them again, and in 69. thou hast a long bout with them, which holds on through 70, 71, and 72. and in pag. 88. thou hast another sling at them; still labouring to mis-represent R. B. as if he had meant any Assembly that might be but supposed to be the Church of Christ, whether it really were so or no. But that the Reader may see how extremely disingenuous, injurious and unjust thou hast been in this case to R. B. I will set down a passage or two out of the same Book of his, concerning this matter. In pag. 57. he says, *Let it be observed, I speak always of the Church of Christ indeed. Hadst thou observed this William, thou mightest have seen at first that there was no footing for thy Cavil.* In pag. 81. he says, *None truly ought nor can be accounted the Church of Christ, but such as are in a measure Sanctified or sanctifying by the Grace of God, and led by his Spirit.* These passages were sufficient, *William*, to manifest the clearness and soundness of R. B's intention and Judgement in those words [*Tolerable Supposition*] and yet in the Epistolary Postscript he since writ (which in thy third part thou hast Printed) he hath superadded much more (which for brevity I forbear transcribing) to render it yet more unquestionably clear, and take away all colour of doubting. Now for thee, *William*, when thou knewest his meaning, both from his Printed Book, from his own Verbal Expression by word of Mouth, and his

own Pen since in a Written Epistle, to pervert his meaning as thou hast done, how unworthy is it of a man!

Sett. 30. Thou speakest in pag. 71. of some Assemblies, that have several Marks and Tokens of the Church of Christ, so far as several things outward, professed and acted may be such, and yet notwithstanding not owned by the Lord as the Church of Christ. And thou leavest it to the judgment of the Impartial and Judicious Reader, whether such things profest and owned, may not be ground for a tolerable supposition, that such Assemblies are the Church of Christ. Now prithee William, what Assemblies are these thou speakest of, that are not owned by the Lord as the Church of Christ, and yet have such marks and tokens of the Church of Christ, as may be ground for a tolerable Supposition that they are the Church of Christ? And what are those marks and tokens, which, in thy judgement, may be ground for a tolerable Supposition; that such Assemblies, as have them, are the Church of Christ, though the Lord own them not as the Church of Christ? I say, in thy judgment, because I think thou wouldst not recommend it to the judgment of the Impartial and Judicious Reader, if it were not agreeable to thy own Judgment.

But 'tis worth thy considering, what a kind of Judgment thou hast the mean while, that can tolerate a Supposition that such Assemblies are the Church of Christ, as at the same time thou confessest are not owned by the Lord as the Church of Christ. Besides, consider what the things are, what the marks and tokens be, which thou wouldst make a ground for the tolerating such an intolerable Supposition. They are (thou sayst) *Professing Faith in Christ, works of Righteousness, and divers Truths owned, by the true Church of Christ. And yet thou sayst, There are Assemblies obvious to every Eye, that knows any thing of Christianity, which cannot on any terms be supposed the Church of Christ. Assign me now if thou canst any Assembly professing Christianity, which doth not profess Faith in Christ, works of Righteousness, and divers Truths owned by the true Church of Christ. If thou canst not (as to be sure thou canst not) then thou mayst see (or at least others that have more clearness of sight may) that those particular things, which thou givest as a ground for a tolerable Supposition that such Assemblies, as profess and own them, are the Church, are the very same and no other*

other than what is profess and own'd by those other Assemblies, which thou art positive cannot on any termes be supposed the Church of Christ, Here *William* (to return thee thy own expression, pag. 47.) thou hast been *labouring and travelling again in the things thou understandest not*, and hast brought forth another of *Babylon's Brats, Confusion*.

Thou addest a further Testimony, viz. That *the World hath too much been troubled with the Sentences, Decrees and decisive Judgments of many Assemblies, supposed to be the Church of Christ, or that on tolerable Supposition have been so termed*. I Answer, thy Testimony in this Case is neither sound nor savoury; for though the World has been troubled with the Sentences, Decrees and decisive Judgments of *false Churches*; yet that those *false Churches* could properly, or in any tolerable Supposition, be termed the Church of Christ, I deny as *unsound*: And thy comparing the Judgment, which, in case of Controversy, the Spirit of God hath given, or at any time may give, through some or other *in the Church of Christ*, which the Sentences, Decrees and decisive Judgments of the *false Churches in the Apostacy*, is very *unsavoury*. But in saying, *The World has been troubled with the Decrees of Assemblies, that on tolerable supposition have been termed the Church of Christ*, thou hast run thy self into this Dilemma, either to condemn the Decrees of the true Church, or affirm that it is tolerable to suppose a false Church to be the Church of Christ. Get out of it as thou canst.

Seet. 31. Nor art thou less out and wrong in thy next page, where thou sayst, *That a number of persons sanctified through the Spirit, Assembled in Christs Name; all Faithful in their places, walking according to their respective measures of Grace which God hath given them, so that none can in Truth say such an Assembly may not properly be called the Church of Christ, being built upon him their Rock, and having perfect Fellowship each with other in the Life of Righteousness: An Assembly of such Members, thou sayst, May be as insensible, and void of understanding in many Divine matters and Mysteries relating to the Kingdom of God, as the Ear of the Natural Body may be insensible of what the Eye doth see. That is wholly, altogether; for the Ear is altogether insensible of what the Eye doth see. This is not according to the line of Truth, or of right Reason either, William: For if they be*

sembled in Christ's name, *Christ himself is in the midst of them*, according to his promise, *Mat. 18. 20.* And sure they that have Christ in the midst of them cannot be so *altogether insensible*, so *wholly void of understanding in many divine matters and mysteries relating to the Kingdom of God*, as the Ear of the natural Body may be of what the Eye doth see. Again, *They that are sanctified through the Spirit, built upon Christ their Rock, assembled in his name, and all faithful in their places, walking according to their respective measures of Grace, which God hath given them*, These are such as Christ promised *John. 14. The Comforter the Spirit of Truth should come unto, and abide with for ever*, ver. 16. That he should *teach them all things*, ver. 26. *lead them into all Truth*, *John 16. 13. And take of Christ's* (to whom all divine matters and Mysteries belong ver. 15.) *and shew unto them*, ver. 14. And can these thus led into *all Truth*, thus taught *all things*, thus made acquainted by the Spirit with the things of Christ, be as insensible and void of understanding in many divine matters and Mysteries relating to the Kingdom of God, as the Ear of the natural Body may be of what the Eye doth see? Such a *Supposition*, William is not tolerable; but such a *Position* (as thou hast made this) is *abominable*. Besides, if it were tolerable so to suppose, yet that would not help thee at all against R. B. For he doth not fix the Judgment of Truth, in case of Controversy, simply and meely in any Assembly (for that he denyes, page 68, 69.) but in the Spirit of God. In such Assemblies and how *meanly* soever thou thinkest of the Church of Christ, yet I hope thou wilt not say *The Spirit of God is insensible and void of Understanding in any divine Matters or Mysteries relating to the Kingdom of God*; Or that any Case of Controversy can be brought before him in any such Assembly, whereof he is not a competent Judge. Ah William, what avails it to talk of the *Line of right Reason and Truth*, and (in writing) walk beside both; What else hast thou done herein, but discover'd thy own weakness and Error, which is the Common Issue of such undertakings? For though in a lofty vaunt thou sayst, *I shall (according to the line of right Reason and Truth) take upon me further to discover the Fallacy of R. B's so confident Assertion*, yet so far art thou there from, that thou dost not answer his Reasons, much less offer any thing that looks like Reason on thy own part. And indeed the rest of thy Discourse,

for

for many leaves together, is so extremely loose and rowing, so indigested and Inconnect, that had I not seen by Name at end of it, and found some passages of the like strain before, I should hardly have thought it had dropt from William Rogers his Pen.

However not wholly to pass it over without some notice, let it be observed. First, that in pag. 74. thou dost plainly *Confess the true Church in the true Faith, and every Member thereof is in some measure (at least) of the same Faith that all the Elect of God are of.* Which Confession of thine, may be Answers sufficient to all thy idle Cavils against believing as the true Church believes, which thou triflest about for divers Pages, repeating here what thou hadst insisted on before in the first Part, and which I have there Answered.

Secondly, But when in pag. 76. thou affirmest, *The whole Church of Christ is liable to err*, thou seemest to have forgotten that the Apostle calls the Church, *The Pillar and ground of Truth*, 1 Tim. 3. 15. And that the Church is frequently in Scripture called, *The Body of Christ*: For want of considering this, thou hast run thy self upon this absurdity, either that Christ may be deprived of his Body, or be the Head of an Erroneous Body; either of which is an Erroneous Opinion. But where, William, didst thou read that, *The whole Church of Christ is liable to err*? Christ never Taught so, the Holy Apostles never preach'd so, the Scriptures of Truth no where speak so, the Friends of Truth never held so; whence then hast thou taken the confidence to affirm so? God by his Prophet speaking of his Church under the Gospel Dispensation or New Covenant, promised that he will put his fear in their hearts, that *they shall not depart from him*, Jer. 32. 40. Christ himself said of his Sheep (which are his Church) *I give unto them Eternal Life, and they shall NEVER PERISH, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand*, John 10. 28. Nay he adds, *My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all, and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand*, ver. 29. And speaking of the false Christs and false Prophets that should arise, he saith Mat. 24. 24. *They should deceive the very Elect, if it were possible*; plainly implying that it is Impossible the Elect should be deceived. Nay, in Mat. 16. 18. he saith expressly, *The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against his Church*. Now when God hath said of his Church or People, *they shall not depart from him*; when

when Christ hath said, they shall *never perish*, none shall pluck them out of his Hand, the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against them, it is *impossible* they should be deceived, &c. What madness led thee to affirm, *The whole Church of Christ is liable to err!* Herein again thou hast manifested thy self to be the *Apostate* and *Innovator*, who hast departed from the *Ancient*, sound, standing Testimony of Truth, and introduced a *New*, unsound, pernicious Opinion, contrary to the Truth, and directly contradictory to the promise of God the Father, and of Christ Jesus his Son.

Thirdly, That after all thy Clamour and Outcry against Discipline, Order and Outward Forms of Government; upon an apprehension, that many are ready to conclude, that an *universal unity* ought to be established in the Churches, by the assistance of outward Instruments, that as we are Members of one Body, so we may not only be one in Faith, one in Doctrine, but also one in Practice with relation to Discipline, Order and outward Forms of Government. Thou sayst, page 83. My Soul should rejoyce to see that day, wherein we might all be so led by the appearance of Christ's Spirit in us, under his Government, which ought to be exalted over all, as that this Oneness might thereby be witnessed amongst all the Families of God's people at this day. This Oneness; that is, to be one not only in Faith and Doctrine, but also in practice with relation to Discipline, Order and outward Forms of Government. Yet in the Index, page 26. thou sayst, *An Universal established Unity, with respect to Faith and Discipline, relating to Believers in Christ, by outward Instruments, is inconsistent with Gospel Liberty.* Is such an Unity inconsistent with Gospel Liberty; and yet would thy Soul rejoyce to see the day wherein such an Unity might be Witnessed, &c. Surely, William; either thy Assertion is wrong, or thy rejoycing would not be right: For they are sufficiently inconsistent one with the other.

Fourthly, In pag. 86. Thou sayst, *A false Liberty cannot get strength by a Plea for a Gospel Liberty.* But this is contradicted by thy two Brethren (whom thou so often celebratest for Ancient and Honourable) John Wilkinson and John Storr, who (in a Paper of theirs which thou hast Printed in thy 4 Part, pag. 40.) say expressly, *We as well as you are sensible, Apostates and bad Spirits, seeking a fleshly liberty, have made use of Arguments deducible from such Principles of Truth, to oppose the Power of God it self, and the practice of Gods People in the Power.* Some

Some other particulars might be taken notice of in thy Observations upon R. B's Epistolary Postscript; but those Observations of thine are so weak and impertinently Cavilling, and his Postscript so clear, demonstrative and plain, that I question not but every considerate Reader will see thy Envy, and condemn thy Injustice towards R. B. in publishing him to the World a man so ill-principled as thou hast represented him to be; especially when he shall read in *pag. 140* this plain Confession of thine (speaking of the Discourse thou hadst with R. B. before a Meeting of Friends at London) *I perceived from the words of Robert Barclay's mouth, that he appeared a better Principled man than his Lines imported.* How ill a Principled man art thou mean while, who (through this whole third Part, and much of the first Part of thy Book) hast made it thy business, by mangling and misquoting R. B's words, and by knowingly perverting his meaning, to represent him a worse Principled man than his Lines imported, and then thou confessest thou perceivedst him to be!

Some Remarks might also be made on thy endeavouring to avoid and disown thy own Letter (which in thy third Part *pag. 115* thou hast Printed) written by thy self, immediately after thy Discourse with R. B. before many Friends at London, wherein having given an Account of that Discourse, and the fair and Christian Deportment of that Meeting, and declared thy satisfaction of R. B's Principles; thou wouldst now retract the same, upon an idle pretence that it was spread without thy Privy or Assent, though thou confessest, *pag. 131* that what thou didst write was *with intent to have sent it of thy own free will to some Friends, by way of Epistle.* But thy shifting and shuffling in this case also is of it self so obvious, that I think it not needful to enlarge upon it. Now therefore to the 4th Part.

CHAP.

C H A P. VII.

Sett. 1. **T**hy fourth Part is suitable to the rest, full of Confusion and Disorder. It is made up mostly of Queries and Answers, with a long Repetition out of the first Part, and Letters from *J. W.* and three to *G. F.* and of *G. F.* to *J. W.* &c. But the design of it is chiefly against *G. F.* whom thou abusest, villifyest, and (to thine own shame, wert thou not past shame) most shamefully entrest. The Queries to *J. W.* and *J. S.* thou settest down, but their Answers thou dost not give fairly, for thou dost not set the Answers at large; but only what thou accountest the substance of them; which shews thou thoughtest they needed Correcting. Yet by what thou hast given of them, it appears that both thy *Johns* were for having *the way of Truth like the way of a Ship in the Sea* (which the Scripture says, is like *the way of an Adulterous woman*, Prov. 30. 20.) *leaving no Impression of Form.* Then there must be *no Form of sound Words, no Form of Godliness*; but all reduced to a *Chaos*, and Truth become (as the Earth once was, while *Darkness was upon the face of the deep*, Gen. 1. 2.) *without Form.* But doubtless had not *Darkness* (deep *Darkness*) been upon them, and an *Adulterous Spirit* from Truth, instead of the Spirit of Truth, moved upon the face of their unstable Waters, they would never have thus run into the *Adulterous Womans way*, nor pleaded for Truths leaving no Impression of Form. And though *J. W.* and *J. S.* deny much of the matter mentioned in the Queries, especially relating to the discouraging of Friends in their Testimonies against Tythes, &c. Yet it is evident from the Narrative of *Dravell Meeting*, Subscribed by above Twenty Faithful Brethren, that it was proved against them at that Meeting, that among divers other things, they were guilty of, they had weakned the hands of Friends in their Testimonies about Tythes, and justified the manner of Friends Meetings about *Presses* (which was hiding in by-places) in the time of Persecution: And whether is of most force, their single denial, or plain and unquestion proof against them, let the Reader judge.

Sett. 2. After the Queries, thou makest some Observations upon them not worth observing; yet because in *pag. 15.* thou sayst, *To me there is one thing above many others, that seems worthy of Observation,* I will take notice of that, that the Reader may see by this Principal one, what the others are like to be. And that is (sayst thou) *the second Query to J. W. when an Answer [Yea]* thou sayst, *could not render him an Offender, unless 'tis sound Doctrine, That the People called Quakers, ought to practice things, that are imposed by man, or in the will of man, which the Scripture gives no Authority or Warrant for.* This is the great, remarkable, observable *one thing above many*: And therefore this had need be Answered. To this therefore I say, that if *J. W.* had Answered plainly [*Yea*] to that Query (as in effect he did) his so Answering would have proved him an Offender, though not in the sense to which thou would strain it: For the Offence would not have lain in denying that the *Quakers* ought to practice things that are imposed in the will of man, &c. (for no Friend affirms or holds they ought). But in suggesting that any thing is so imposed by Friends, which is a *notorious Falshood and foul Scandal*, and therefore the Suggester of it must needs therein be a great Offender.

Now *William*, having Answered thy Capital Observation, give me leave to make another thus, Thou seemest to be the Author of this fourth Part, and to have written it thy self; and therefore in the Title-page of this Part thou dost not say (as in the three former) by *William Rogers* and others, &c. but barely and simply, by *William Rogers*, and thou goest on in the first person singular [*I must confess, &c. I am well satisfied, &c. I proceed, and the like*] which any man that reads, will conclude that thou art, and wouldst be taken to be the only, sole, and single Author of this 4th Part: Yet in *pag. 20.* I read thus, *However that the Impartial Reader may here have one Instance that this our sense is not wholly groundless, WE say, John Wilkinson and WILLIAM ROGERS testify, that &c.* What means this *William*? Dost thou call thy self for a Witness? *William Rogers* says, that *William Rogers Testifies*. This is a pretty piece of Folly *William*; but yet I will not say, as thou dost of thy Observation, that 'tis *one above many others*: For thou hast more of them. Thou broughtest thy self in for a Witness once or twice

before, in first Part pag. 62. and 95. but that was not altogether so absurd, for then thou wast in company with others, who might be supposed to put thee forward. But now pretendest to be single, to stand alone, and therefore couldst have none to call thee to it. Thou wilt say perhaps that this Sentence is in the midst of that part of thy Discourse which thou repeatest out of the first Part. 'Tis true, it is so. But though it be in the midst of that, it is no part of it: For in the first Part, whence the Objection and Answer is taken, there is no mention of J. W's or thy Testifying, nor yet of the matter you here take upon you to testify. So that this is a Clause wherein they are not concerned, but thrust in merely by thy self, and one would think on purpose to discover thy own Folly; which had been obvious enough without this. But to proceed.

Sett. 3. In pag. 27. Thou quarrellest with G. F. for writing (as thou sayst) in a Letter to thee, thus, *I tell thee, them that thou callest Accused, are not right; for had they been right, and in the Light and Power of God, as at the first, they would have come to me when I sent for them.* Upon this thou revilest G. F. at thy pleasure; and in pag. 65. Insinuatest by way of Query, *That G. is of so high and lofty a Spirit, as to endeavour to assume unto himself a Power to judge of all Cases amongst Friends, even from North to South; and that such who will not come unto him at Swarthmore in Lancashire, for that end, when he sends for them, are lyable to be censured to be wrong, &c.* Now this is a most malicious Insinuation of a slander, William: For first it is well known that at that time, G. F. was so weak in Body that he could scarce go out of the Doors; and therefore could not go to them, though they might have come to him if they had pleased. Secondly, G. F's sending for them to come to him, was not by way of command, but of Request, and that for the sake of the Churches peace, as in his Letter to John Wilkinson, (dated the 16th. of 10th. Month 76. and Printed in thy fourth Part pag. 44.) appears, where he says, pag. 60. ——— *Had you retained your primitive Love, and Light, and Faith, that works by Love, and been in the quiet, meek Spirit, and the Gospel of Peace, and in the Wisdom that is peaceable, you would have sought the peace, or come to me, AS I DESIRED YOU, before these things broke out.* Now William, when for Peace sake, and for their

their own Souls sake, G. F. had sent them a Friendly, Kind and Christian Invitation to come over to him, who (through Bodily weakness) was not in a condition to go to them; for thee to represent G. F. therein as a man of an high and lofty Spirit, as one endeavouring to assume unto himself a Power to judge of all Cases amongst Friends, even from North to South, discovers a most malicious and wicked mind in thee. How contrary is thy Spirit to the Spirit of God! The Lord bringeth good out of evil: Thou dost what thou canst to bring Evil of good; which shews what Spirit thou art of.

Self. 4. As for the Character thou givest of G. F. in pag. 64. (in a causeless comparison drawn between J. W. and him) it is full of Envy, Detraction and Falsehood. Thou reflectest on the meanness of his Parentage, as if thy own Extractions had been Extraordinary. Thou speakest as Scornfully of his being a Shoemaker, as conceitedly of thy own being a Merchant. When as perhaps upon a strict Inquiry, G. F. would have no cause to blush at his, nor thou to boast of thy own Pedigree: For though G. F. was by Trade a Shoemaker, yet neither was he the Son of Shoemaker, nor thou the Son of a Merchant; but he (I have heard) was the Son of an honest Husbandman, and thou the Son of a Smith. Of most men therefore it least became thee to upbraid G. F. with the Lowness of his Parentage, or meanness of his Trade, since all men surely will confess that, of the two, it is more reputable to make Shoes for men, than to make Shoes for Horses. But I forbear any further pursuit of this Subject: For 'tis below me, William, to reflect on other mens Fortunes; nor had I given this Touch, but to Check that unworthy humour in thee, who hast so Insolently upbraided a better man than thy self. And yet when with all the contempt and disdain thou wert capable of, thou hadst set forth his Meanness according to the Meanness of thy own Spirit, thou sayst, For his Meanness, he neither was nor is despised, as we know of; for that cannot savour of a Christian Spirit. No sure, nor of a worthy manly Spirit neither. And therefore, besides the Falsehood of thy saying, for his Meanness he is not despised (which every man of Sense that reads thee cannot chuse but savour) thy mentioning his Meanness in such a despising, scornful, reproachful way as thou hast done, shews thee a man of a mean, low, sordid, base mind.

So far from being of a Christian Spirit, that thou fallest very much short of the Spirit of a worthy man. Thou chargest him with *not labouring with his Hands*, &c. Which is more than thou knowest; but if it were so, and that be in thy esteem a Crime; how wilt thou acquit thy Ancient and Honourable Brother *John Story* therefrom? Nay how much of thy *Scornful Reflections* might be easily retorted upon him! But I forbear; both because I dislike such unmanly dealing, and for that I understand he is lately gone to his place. G. F. thou sayst, *his Married Judge Fell's Widdow*. Well, what then? is that a Crime? If it be, shew wherein: If it be not, bite thy Tongue, for shewing so much Envious Folly. Again thou sayst, *When he Travels, 'tis certainly known, he hath had such Attendance, which (considering the work he is on) may be termed great*. Such Attendance! what Attendance? I have known something of his manner of Travelling, and have sometimes had the opportunity of Travelling with him: Yet I never saw this great Attendance, thou speakest of; nor can conceive what thou meanest by it, unless thou callest Friends that bear him Company to Meetings where he comes, his Attendance. Is this thy Meaning, *William*? Is that the Phrase among your selves? when you were wont to conduct your two Ancient and Honourable Brethren to and fro; Did you go then as *their Attendance*? Methinks then your own practice should have kept thee from Cavilling. What work would thou have made with *Paul*, hadst thou lived in his day, who was wont to be *notably attended* in this sense, that is accompanied in his Travels by the Brethren, nay sometime by the whole Church, Acts 21. 5. And before, through the abounding of Iniquity, love grew cold, many of thy Party would not have thought much to have attended on G. F. in this Sense. But thou addest, that of late he hath Travelled with a Man, termed *George Fox's Man*. Termed! what if he were termed so, and were not so? Some perhaps out of Ignorance, and others with thy self out of Envy, may have termed some *George Fox's men* that never were so. And 'tis much, but if thou hadst then lived, thou wouldst have called *Luke, Sylvanus and Titus, Paul's men* (for they used to Travel with him) but especially *Timothy*, whom he sent for to come to him, and bring him his Cloak, 2 Tim. 4. 13. But suppose G. F. hath sometimes Travelled with a Man that was his Menial Servant: what is the evil of that? Thou saidst

saidst but now, he Married Judge *Fell's* Widow, and if he had as little of his own, as thou representest him to have, or as thou wouldst be willing he should have, yet was not Judge *Fell's* Widow, thinkest thou, able to keep him a Man? She kept many for her own Service before she Married him, and doth still: And what if one of them hath sometimes Ridden with him? Sure none that knows *G. F.* and understandingly considers how unweldy and Stiff his Limbs are become, through extreme Cold and other Hardships, sustained in Prisons for his Testimony to Truth, but will think he hath need enough to have some or other Travel with him. But thou art through Envy so inconsiderate, that thou grudgest his having either Servant or Companion. Thou addest, *And as to the enjoyment of things that are lawful in the Creation, that may be termed necessary for the ease of the Body, and pleasure of the Pa'lat, it is certainly known, that G. F. hath often freely made use thereof, when he had, in a manifold larger degree, than John Wilkinson (so far as we can understand) ever did.* This shews thy Malice, and the Meanness of thy mind. I have heard of giving a man Rost-meat, and Beating him with the Spit; but I am apt to think thou dost here Beat one with thy Spit, to whom thou hast not often given Rost-meat. Thy suggestion imports (and is designed to import) that *G. F.* is greatly addicted to *Epicurism* and Belly-Cheer? but thou couldst hardly have cast this Reflection upon any, from whom it would have more easily fallen: For few men I think (if any) are more *Absentious* and Temperate in their Diet, or more regardless of their Diet. As many as have had opportunities of observing him, are Witnesses of this; and upon my own Observation I can say, His care in his Travels hath been to prevent Friends from providing any thing more than Ordinary, so far has he been from indulging himself. But he needs no defence; his manner of Life is well known to Friends throughout the Nation, and the Lord hath given him an Honourable place in the Hearts of many Thousands. And though I doubt not but with a Christian Generosity he can trample upon all thy Reproaches; yet certainly, *William*, the course thou hast taken to Defame him, will render thee Infamous with all that shall come to know it, who are not of as poor, mean, low, base, course and envious Spirit as thy self.

CHAP. VIII.

Sett. 1. **I**T begins with an Account of some of your dissatisfactions, exhibited against G. F. touching certain passages in a Book of his, intituled [*This is an Encouragement to all the Women's Meetings in the world, &c.*] Which you take to be either unsound or impertinently quoted. And the first Quotation you quarrel with is in page 43. of the said Book, where it is said, *And was not Micah's Mother a virtuous Woman? read Judges 17. and see what she said to her son.* Against this you object that she was an Idolatrous Woman. And a great noise and clutter you make about her, throughout your Book. In first Part, page 62. (according to my Observation) you begin with her, and page 65. you are at her again. In 3 part, p. 140. you have another fling at her, and in 4 part, page 71. you are at her afresh. In page 93, 94, and 96. she is fetch'd up again. And in this Fifth Part, not only here, in page 4. but in page 33, 34, and 39. she is fetch'd about again. So that Eleven times over you pleased your selves with railing at Micah's Mother, And the sum of all your clamour is, that she *curst* and was an Idolatress. To the first I say, It doth not appear by the Text to be a prophane Curse, but rather such a Curse as Jacob feared from his Father, when he said to his Mother, *My Father peradventure will feell me, and I shall seem to him as a Deceiver, and I shall bring a Curse upon me, and not a blessing*, Gen. 27. 12. Now Isaac, was questionless a very Religious and pious man, far no doubt from prophane and wicked Cursing, yet Jacob knew that if his Father catch'd him in deceit, he should be in danger of being curst by his Father. Nor did Rebecca to incourage him say, Fear not my Son, thy Father is a good man, and therefore dares not curse thee; But she said, *Upon me be thy Curse my Son*, verse 13. Noah was a good man and a Preacher of Righteousness, yet he curst Canaan, Gen. 9. 25. Elisha was an eminent Prophet of God, on whom a double portion of Elisha's Spirit rested: Yet did he solemnly curse those Children in the name of the Lord, that in prophane Mockage called him Bald-head. 2

Kings 2. 22, 23. Now that the Curse you quarrel at this woman for was not a prophane Curse, but a solemn Curse denounced against him that was guilty not only of theft, in robbing her, but (in her account) of sacrilege also, in robbing God, unto whom she had wholly dedicated the Mony, *Judge 17. 3.* is very probable, first, in that the Text doth not charge her with it as an Evil, nor set any mark of Reproof upon it; 2. In regard of the Effect it wrought, the force and influence it had upon her Son; it brought him both to confess his fault and to restore the Mony. So those learned Translators of the Bible, *Tremellius* and *Junius* understood it, and in their Notes upon the place say thus [*As if he said, I being struck with the bearing of thy Curse, do acknowledge my fault.*] If it be objected that she presently blessed him whom she had cursed; the answer is, first, that it doth not appear what distance of time there was between her Curse and her blessing, though certain it is there was some: for her Curse is spoken of in the *Preterit* Tense, but her Blessing in the *Present*. But 2. Were there never so little time between, yet those things which were most conducive to the taking off the Curse, and obtaining the blessing, did intervene, namely, his acknowledgement of his offence and making *restitution*. And it is the more likely that the Curse was grave and Solemn, not wicked and prophane in as much as the Blessing is so solemn, and that which is frequently used in Scripture in weighty and Solemn cases. Since then it appears from Scripture Evidence that in that time, good men might without offence denounce a solemn Curse, and it doth not appear, by any Scripture Testimony, that this of *Mical's* Mother was any other; nay, since there is so much reason to perswade that it was a solemn, not a prophane Curse; how unreasonable are you, upon this score to fly out as you do upon the woman, and deny her to have any thing of Wisdom, virtue or Faith!

Now to the 2 part of your Charge, that she was an Idolatress, I have this to say; So were at that time the Jewish people in general. She lived in a gloomy and dark time. *Joshua* was dead and so were the Elders that had seen the mighty works, and great deliverances of the Lord (And the word of the Lord was precious in those days: There was no open vision, *1 Sam. 3. 1.*) And after their death, the People forsook the Lord, and served strange Gods, *Judges 2.* Now though the Lord was hereby greatly

greatly provoked, and displeased with them, in so much that he punished them with sold servitude under the Kings of the Heathen; yet did he not wholly cast them off, but owned them still to be his People; and often wrought deliverances for them. And therefore for you so wholly to reject them, as if there were nothing good in them, is very uncharitable and hard measure. For as to this woman, though she was not wholly exempt from the Common Evil of her Age and Nation, yet it is evident she retained a great Respect and Devotion to God, and Zeal for his service, though he used in the manner of performing it. For she had dedicated ~~this~~ *her* Money to the Lord, even 1107 shekels of silver; and her son took care to get him a Levite for his Priest, in hopes that then the Lord would bless him. So that their Eye was not to the Lord, it seems, in what they did, although by reason of the Cloudiness of the day wherein they lived their sight was not clear. Will you judge that whole people, that because they had Images, therefore there was not a wife or a virtuous one among them? *Ruth* lived about the same time (at least in the time of the Judges, *Ruth* 1. 1.) and was a *Moaabite*, verse 4. one of the people of *Moaab*, who were Enemies to and Oppressors of *Israel*, *Judge* 3. 14. and served strange Gods, *Ruth* 1. 15. Yet is she called in Scripture a virtuous Woman, *Ruth* 3. 11. and no doubt was so. Not only after she came to be a Jewish Proselyte, but before: for *Boaz*, who calls her a virtuous woman, *Ruth* 3. 11. tells her also (and that, as the ground of his kindness to her) *Chap. 2. 19*. It hath fully been shewed me all that thou hast done unto thy Mother-in-law, since the death of thy Husband, &c. Which related to the time of her Gentile-state, while she dwelt in the land of *Moaab*, and served the God's of the *Moaabites*.

Gideon was one of the Judges, whom God raised up to deliver *Israel* by, and the Lord was eminently with him. Yet he, having overthrown the *Midianites*, of the Ear-rings of the Prey made an *Ephod*, and set it in his City *Ophrah*, and all *Israel* went thither awhoring after it; which thing, it is said, became a Snare to *Gideon*, and to his House, *Jud.* 8. 27. But will you from hence conclude that there was neither wisdom nor virtue in *Gideon*?

Rachel I suppose you I grant, was a virtuous Woman; yet she both stole her Father's Gods, and with feigned words deceived

him also, when he came to *Search* for them, *Gen. 31. 35.* Nor did she take them to destroy, but to keep, and kept them almost to her dying day. And, as the text imports, both she and her family corrupted themselves with them: for when *Jacob*, by God's appointment prepared to go to *Bethel*, there to make an Altar unto God, he laid unto his Household, and to all that were with him, *Put away the strange Gods that are among you, and be clean* (they had defiled themselves it seems with those strange Gods) *and change your garments*, *Gen. 35. 1. 2.* Now not to detract in the least from *Rachel*, but only to shew you the partiality of your too severe and unjust Censure, what great difference was there between the Cases of *Rachel* and *Micah's* Mother? The one is said to have curld him that stole that mony which she had dedicated to the Lord; the other stole her Father's Gods, and by a false pretence deceived him when he searched her Tent for them. The one made Images with her mony; the other polluted her self and family with the Images she had stolen from her Father. Ye there you'l celebrate (I suppose) for a virtuous Woman (as no doubt she was) but trample upon *Micah's* Mother as an Idolatrous Woman, in whom virtue had no place. If you exclude all from having any share in virtue, who in those early ages had Images in their houses, I doubt you'l leave but few that might be called virtuous. [We read of those *Assyrians*, whom *Salmanesar* transplanted out of *Assyria*, and placed in the Cities of *Samaria*, when he carried *Israel* Captive into *Assyria*, *2 Kings 17.* That they feared the Lord (being thereunto instructed by an *Israelitish* Priest, verse 28.) and yet served their own Gods, verse 33. And in verse 41. 'Tis said of them, *So these Nations feared the Lord and served their graven Images.* Or (as some read it) *served him with graven Images.* Now these that feared the Lord although they worshipped him not aright, had they no virtue, think you? [*Rahab*, you know, was not originally of *Israel*, but an *Heathen*, an Inhabitant, of *Jerico*, an *Heathenish* City, that served strange Gods, and by God's appointment was to be, and was destroyed. Yet is her Faith recored, *Heb. 11. 31.* and she celebrated amongst the worthies of *Israel*. Had she no virtue think you? Nay did she not shew both Wisdom and virtue, as well as Faith, in the whole transaction with the *Israelitish* Spies? Read *Joshua 2.* and 6 Chapters. The author to the *Hebrews* calls her the *Harlot*,

Heb,

Heb. 11. 31. But he does not commend her for that, but for her *faith*. The Apostle *James* calls her the *Harlot*, Jam. 2. 25. But he does not commend her for that, but for her *words*: No more does *G. F.* mention *Micah's* Mother for her *Idolatry*, but for her *Zeal to God*. And if *Rahab's* being an *Harlot* (supposing her so) and *Idolatreſs* (as she must needs then be) did not hinder her from being commended for her *faith*, and for her *work*, why should *Micah's* Mother's Images hinder her from being commended for her *Zeal*? [I have insisted the longer on this, because you make so great a Clamour about it, throwing it at *G. F.* at every turn, and calling it an *abominable Quotation*. What work would you have made with the Apostle? How would you have ranted at him (had you then lived) for quoting one whom he calls an *Harlot*, and who doubtless was an *Idolatreſs*, as an *Example* and instance of the virtue and power of Faith, and for an *Encouragement* to the Believing *Hebrews*? But it is evident your calling this Instance of *Micah's* Mother an *Abominable Quotation* is but an effect of your *abominable Envy* against *G. F.* whom you charge with saying to *William Rogers*, *He ſaw it would be a ſtumbling-block*; And thereupon clamours against him for *laying ſtumbling-Blocks in the way of God's people*, which you repeat over and over, half a dozen times, in your 1. 4. and 5. parts. Whether *G. F.* said so or no, I neither know nor think much material: For if he had said, or did say, what thou, *William*, chargeſt on him; yet those words (even as thou haſt ſet them down) do not expreſs that he ſaid he ſaw it would be a ſtumbling-block to the *People of the Lord*. Nor doth it appear that it is ſo, though thou and ſome other, ſuch as have made Profeſſion of Truth, but are departed from the ſimplicity of it, and have liſted up your ſelves in an high, lofty, proud, ſcornful, diſdainful, captious and contentious Spirit againſt the Truth and thoſe that have kept their Habitations therein, take occaſion to be offended and ſtumble at it. But what if the Lord hath ordered or permitted this for thee and others to ſtumble at, who by ſeeding on the *Tree of Knowledge* are growing up in the *carнал Wiſdom* and in a *puffed up Conceit* and ſelf-will are deſpiling, the appearance and work of the Lord as too low, mean and contemptible in your *lofty* Opinions? It is juſt with the Lord ſo to do; and no new thing: For thou mayſt read what the Lord by his Prophet threatened to ſome of old,

who had been called his People, but were grown wanton and kicked against him, *Behold, I will lay stumbling-blocks before that People, saith the Lord, Jer. 6. 21.*

Sett. 2. The second Quotation you Cavil at in G. F.'s fore-mentioned Book, is the Instance of the Women of Tekoah; of whom G. F. said, pag. 43. *And the Women of Tekoah, see what a Sermon she Preached to King David, which convinced him, 2 Sam. 13. 14.* Against this you exclaim and say pag. 5. *The Scripture quoted informs, that the Woman was a subtil Woman, whom Joab caused to gain her self as a Mourner, and go to King David with a Lying Story in her Mouth, &c.* And you charge her with deceiving King David by her Lies, and repeat the words [*Lies in her Mouth, and Lying Story*] over and over. I Answer, Though you in your subtilty call her a subtil Woman, yet the Scripture calls her a Wise Woman: Nor doth the Scripture say she went with a Lying Story in her Mouth; and therefore it is a lying Spirit which thus abuleth both her and the Scripture. The words she spake, the Scripture doth not call a lying Story, but a Form of Speech, 2 Sam. 14. 20. of which kind Examples in Scripture are frequent. Nor doth it appear (as you say it doth) That David was appeased as to his Son Absalom before the Woman came to him: For though his Natural Affection went out towards his Son, yet after he had (through Joab's Mediation, by means of the Woman) permitted him to return to Jerusalem, it was two full years before David would see him, ver. 28. Nor then, but by the Intercession of Joab, a man of great Power and Interest with him. And surely this is no great sign of his being appeased: Nor would there have been need of such a court as Joab took, had he been appeased before. But whether he were or no, William, without all doubt the Woman was (as the Scripture calls her) a wise Woman. Her management of the Business proves her so; nor canst thou convict her of any thing inconsistent with Virtue: For so far was she from Lying to the King, as thou (with too much Indecency and little Reverence to the Scriptures) chargest her, that she told the King plainly and downright the Naked Truth of the matter, when he asked her, *If the hand of Joab was with her in that thing, ver. 19.* But whether will thy Hot-brain'd fury transport thee, William, thus wickedly to call a Scripture Parable a Lying Story! Did

John Story teach thee this? Or was he one of those other thou mentionest, pag. 3v. who were concerned with thee in drawing up these your dissatisfactions against G. F. You that say, you are not satisfied that G. F. hath of late been guided by the Spirit of Truth, &c. Because he hath numbred the Woman of Tekoah among the Wise and Virtuous Women, mentioned in Holy Writ, have said enough to satisfy all (that shall rightly weigh the matter) that you were guided by a false and foul Spirit, in calling this a *Lying Story* which the Holy Ghost hath made a part of *Sacred Story*. What, *William*, what! must all the Parables in the Bible be now rejected for *Lying Stories*? God forbid. How frequently did Christ himself use such Parabolical Forms of Speech (as, of the *two Sons*, Mat. 21. 28. Of the *Householder* that planted a *Vineyard*, ver. 33. Of the man that fell among *Thieves*, Luke 10. 30. Of the *Unjust Steward*, Luke 16. 1. Of the *Prodigal Son*, Luke 15. 11. Of the *Unjust Judge*, Luk. 18. 2. and too many more to instance) which thy Language [of a *Lying Story*] cast a most horrid and Blasphemous Reflection on? But what thinkest thou, *William*, of the Parable of the *Eagles* in *Ezekiel* 17. was that a *Lying Story*? Or what wilt thou call the Parable wherewith *Nathan* caught the same King *David* (much after the manner as the Woman of Tekoah did) was that a *Lying Story*? Did *Nathan* come to the King with Lyes in his Mouth, as thou wickedly sayst of her? wilt thou say he deceived King David by his Lyes, as thou filthily suggestest of her? *David*, we may be sure, did not take Parables to be *Lying Stories*, when he said, *I will incline mine Ear to a Parable*, Psal. 49. 4. But I hate and abhor Lying, Psal. 119. 163. And again, *He that telleth Lyes shall not tarry in my sight*, Psal. 101. 7. If for a shift thou wilt say, *Nathan* was sent of God; I Answer, So was the Woman of Tekoah too, for ought thou knowest. There is ground from the Text to suppose, that it was not barely *Joab's* contrivance, but that the Counsel of the Lord was in it. For the Text is express, *Neither doth God respect any person, yet doth he devise means, that his banished be not expelled from him*, 2 Sam. 14. 14. And surely *William*, it had been but necessary for thee, and those others concerned with thee, to have considered how far the means in that Case, used by the Woman of Tekoah, was of Gods devising, before you had branded it for a *Lying Story*, and her for one that came with Lyes in her Mouth.

Sett. 53.

Sect. 3. The third Quotation you Cavil at, is in pag. 23, of
 G. F's forementioned Book, where he says, *And the Women had
 their Assemblies in the days of the Judges and the Kings, and Old
 Ely's Sons abused them, &c.* Now Old Ely was not against the
 Assemblies of the Women, who Assembled by Troops, as you may see
 in 1 Sam. 2. 21, 22, &c. Against this you object, pag. 6. That
 this only proves that there was an Assembly of Men and Women at
 the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, who committed Evil
 together. I Answer, the Text speaks of an Assembly of Wo-
 men, not of Men and Women, as you without any ground
 affirm: For here's no mention of Men, as of the Assembly,
 nor of any other Men at all but *Ely's Sons*, who had but two,
 that we read of; and though they did abuse some of those Wo-
 men, that did there Assemble, yet it is not very likely that
 they would so abuse them in that Assembly. Neither doth the
 evil committed by *Ely's Sons* with any of the Women who so
 Assembled, above any thing of the force of the Instance, which
 was to prove that in those days such Assemblies of Women there
 were, of which the Scripture quoted is a plain and positive
 Evidence. You would gladly have it understood, that this
 Assembly was only of such Women, as came to be legally pu-
 rified after Child-birth, which fancy you ground upon an obscure
 Marginal Note in the Scriptures, as you say, but do not shew
 that it might be examined. The concealment of your Note takes
 off the Authority you would have it have. You should have
 directed where your Note was to be found, if you intended it
 should have been *Noted*: For it is a pretty deal too large and
 at Random, to tell us there is a Marginal Note in the Scriptures,
 without assigning where. But be your Note as Notable as it will,
 I doubt not but by Arguments and Authority to weigh it
 down, and shew that those Assemblies were not upon the score
 of legal Purification after Travel, as you are willing to imagine.
 For first those Women Assembled in great Numbers, or by
 Troops (so the Marginal Note upon the place tells us the He-
 brew reads it) and sure it sounds ~~not~~ very unlikely, that the
 Women should Assemble by Troops or Companies to be Pu-
 rified after their Travel: For since the time of their Purification
 after Child-Birth was fixed and appointed by the Law, if you
 will suppose they came in Troops to be Purified, you must sup-
 pose

you were delivered by Troops also. But 2. That you may see your mistake more fully, consult Scripture, *Exod. 38.8.* and you will find that Women Assembled, and that by Troops, at the Door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, before your Precept for Purification, *Levit. 12.6.* (which ye bring to set off your Marginal Note) was given. For in *Exod. 38.8.* It is said, *And he made the Laver of Brass, and the foot of it of Brass, of the Looking-glass of the Women Assembling, which Assembled at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation.* By this (if you had taken the right way) you might have informed your selves better from the Scripture it self, than from your Marginal Note, somewhere or other, in the Scriptures. But yet further, to set a Note against your Note, and direct too where you may find it, which is more than you have done yours. Those Learned Translators of the Bible, Tremellius and Junius, say, *Those Looking-glasses whereof the Laver was made, were offered by the Women, who in pious Affection, and Religious Devotion, did run together in Troops, or Companies, to offer unto God.* See their Annotation upon *Exod. 38.8.* to which they refer from *1 Sam. 2.22.* This could not have relation to the Legal Purifyings of Women after Travel, both as this was in practice before that was in Precept, and as these Oblations (of Looking Glasses) were not only Voluntary, those enjoyned *Levit. 12.* but these quite different from those which in that Case were required to be offered. So that you may now see (if you are not resolved not to see) that Women had their Assemblies in the times of the Judges and the Kings, which is what G. F. brought this Instance to prove. And since it is manifested that the end of their Assemblies, were not (as you mislead by a Marginal Note, did imagine) for Legal Purification after Travel, your Query, grounded on that mistake, falls together with it.

Seet. 4. The fourth Quotation you Cavil at, is in *pag. 32.* of G. F.'s fore-mentioned Book, The Passage is the Counsel which Rachel and Leah gave to Jacob, *Gen. 31. 14, 15, 16.* This, you say, you take to be a Quotation to evidence Womens speaking in the Church to be according to Truth: But yet, you say, you cannot own it to be much (if any thing at all) better Argument for Womens speaking in the Church of God, where the Church is

met to Worship the Lord in his Spirit, than Womens Discourses with their Husbands about their Outward Estates, doth almost every day produce amongst us. Whatever you take this Quotation to be brought for, it was and is an evidence that *Rachel* and *Leah* were Wife, Virtuous, Religious Women. *Jacob's* Discourse to them, and theirs to him, was more than Ordinary and Common discourse, betwixt men and their Wives about their Estates. The Lord had appeared to *Jacob*, and commanded him to return unto the Land of his Fathers and Kindred, and had renewed withal his Promise that he would be with him and deal well by him. This *Jacob* imparted to his Wives *Rachel* and *Leah*, who did not draw back, or oppose the motion, but having Faith in the Promise, readily consented, and gave up to leave their Kindred and Fathers House, and with their Husband follow the Lord, though into a strange Country. And this is an Argument of *Virtue* and *Faith* in those two Women. But your comparing it to the common Discourses of Women with their Husbands about their Outward Estates, is an Argument you have not a right sense of the extraordinary Hand and disposing Providence of God in that matter; and therefore your Comparison is Irreverent and unsavoury, of which you have cause to be ashamed.

Self. 5. The fifth and last Quotation you carp at, is in the 42. pag. of G. E's fore-mentioned Book, where speaking of *Jephtha's* Daughter, it is said, *And the Daughters of Israel, went yearly to lament the Daughter of Jephtha*, Judges 11. So here they had a yearly Meeting upon this occasion. This, you say, occasions you to Query, whether such a Meeting occasioned on the untimely death of a Virgin (for *Jephtha's* Vow was a rash Vow) can be any evidence of the matter which is taken by us to be intended, viz. Either for Womens Speaking in the Church, or Womens Meeting distinct from Men on the account of Worship to God, or performing Acts of Government, relating to Church Discipline? I Answer, your Query is grounded on a mis-understanding of the Scripture. You say that Meeting of the Daughters of Israel was occasioned by the untimely Death of a Virgin: But the Scripture cited doth not say so. Nor, had you consulted the Text well, with the Marginal Notes upon it, would you have found cause so to conclude. For the Text says, Judges 11. 39. He

did

did with her according to his Vow. Now his Vow was, ver. 31. *Whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my House to meet me, when I return in Peace from the Children of Ammon, shall be the Lords, and I will offer it up for a Burnt-offering.* But in the Margin, instead of [*And I will offer it up*] it is [*Or I will offer it up*] which shews there was regard had in the Vow to the *fineness* of the Subject (or thing Vowed) for a *Burnt-offering*. So that if what came forth to meet him were *not* fit for Sacrifice, it should be dedicated or Consecrated to the Lord: If it were fit for Sacrifice it should then be offered for a Burnt-offering. But *Jephtha's* Daughter was *not* fit to be made a Burnt-offering, for that had been *Inhumane*, and too like the Sacrifices of the Heathen, forbidden by the Law, *Levit. 18. 21.* It is therefore more reasonable to believe, that her Father, according to his Vow, gave her to the Lord, that is, devoted, dedicated or consecrated her, in an especial manner, to the Service of God, than that he sacrificed her for a Burnt-offering. And the rather, for that we do not read she had the two Months time to bewail her Death, but to bewail her *Virginity*; whereupon, immediately after it is said, *He did with her according to his Vow*, it follows, *And she knew no man.* And in the next Verse, where we read the Daughters of *Israel* went yearly to lament, in the Margin it is, *to talk with the Daughter of Jephtha*, &c. Which shews she was alive, *not* sacrificed. The Translators of the Bible, *Tremellius* and *Junius*, in their Annotations upon this place, say, *He performed his Vow upon her*, that is, *he did not redeem her by a price of Money, as he might have done by the Law, Levit. 27. 4. But left her consecrated to the Lord, and for this reason would not permit her to Marry, lest she should seem to belong to any other than the Lord.* Now if *Jephtha's* Daughter was *not* sacrificed, or brought (as your word is) to an untimely death, but in a peculiar and special manner dedicated to the Service of the Lord; and that thereupon the Daughters of *Israel* did use to meet four days in a year yearly (as the Text expressly says) and that to talk, discourse or confer with her who was thus dedicated to the Lord (as not only *Tremellius*, *Junius* and *Arius Montanus* read it, but the Margin of our *English* Bibles also Note) who then can deny, but there were in those days *Womens Meetings*, or suspect that they were for any other than a Religious and pious end.

Sect. 6. Having thus far answered your Cavil against G. F.'s Quotations, the next thing I take notice of is the Account you give of several Meetings held at *Bristol* about those and other matters in which you pretend to be dissatisfied. Previous to those Meetings there were it seems certain Propositions agreed on, and signed by a Friend (whom you name not) on the one hand, and *William Rogers* on the other. These you set down, page 10, 11. And in these I observe great care was taken, that a Narrative of the proceedings of those Meetings might be made by joyn't consent of both Parties; the reason of which is Obvious, that neither side might, by a partial Account or Relation, misrepresent things to the prejudice of the other. Yet in page 12. you acknowledge that after the said Meetings two of you (*viz. William Ford and William Rogers*) did send abroad *An Account*, &c. And this you did without the consent, nay without the knowledge and privity of those Friends, by whose consent, according to your agreement the Narrative ought to have been drawn. For this some of you were it seems (as well they might be) charged with *breach of Covenant*; which you not only here complain of, but struggle hard, in page 15, 16, 17. to cast off, and yet it sticks fast to you. Your shuffling about it does but shew your Confusion, and you cannot acquit your selves of the imputation of *Covenant-breaking*. For when you have told us page 15. that by the Agreement, *Each party had liberty to have a scribe to take passages in the Conference, and that when any thing was read, and finally agreed by both parties to be recorded, the same should be at the end of every Meeting subscribed by both Parties, and by at least six credible persons of each side*; You add, *But not a word intimating that no other Relation should go forth*. Indeed! I should have thought (and so I believe will every one that considerately reads the Agreement) that every word in that part of it, relating to a Narrative, did intimate that no other Relation should go forth. What else I pray, doth so great care and caution, as is expressed in the Agreement, bespeak? The first Article of your Agreement says, *That each may have a Scribe to take all those passages in the Conference; which to them severally shall seem meet; And that*
before

before any one head be left, or a new matter begun, all that each Party have thought fit to have written be first read; if in any thing defective, amended; and finally, agreed by both persons to be a true Record, Minute, or Memorial of the Conference, &c. The second Article adds, That all things so written by both Scribes, and so agreed upon to be recorded, shall be at the end of every Meeting subscribed by both parties, and by at least six credible persons of each sides, and by as many more as shall please to sign the same, as witnesses of what is so recorded; and the said six respectively to be named before the Meeting begin, and they then to declare that they are free to it, &c. What greater circumspection and wariness could have been used? What better provision could have been made, or greater care taken that no Narrative, Relation or Account of the passages of that Meeting should go forth, but by *joynt-consent* of each Party? So that if the reason, intention and implication of that agreement did not lay a restraint upon each Party from giving forth any Relation, Account or Narrative of the proceeding of that Meeting, but what should be jointly drawn up after the manner, and according to the Terms of that Agreement: But that each Party, notwithstanding that agreement, was intentionally and designedly left at liberty, to write and disperse what Narrative, relation or Account he or they should please, according as their affection, inclination or Judgment should lead them, your agreement it self, at least with respect to that (which was the main) part of it, was altogether insignificant and to no purpose. But the Method you began in, the Caution and Wariness you used, the care you took, and provision you made in your agreement, plainly shew the intent and meaning of your agreement was, that no Relation, no Narrative, no Account should be given forth by any of either Party, but what should be drawn up by *joynt-consent*, and subscribed by some of each Party deputed thereunto. Now this being so, this being the plain and naked scope and drift of this part of your agreement, what else can you be but *Covenant-breakers*, who have given forth a Relation or Narrative of the proceedings of that Meeting, without the consent, knowledge or privity of those of the other Party, contrary to the intent, purport, true meaning and natural tendency of your own agreement? And indeed, the *fig-leave*

pretences you would cover your selves with, are arguments not of Innocency, but of *guilt*: for what can be more idle and impertinent than to alleadge (as you do page 16.) that it was no part of the Articles, that what was to be agreed upon as a Narrative should be sent abroad? How then would it have been a Narrative, if it had not been to be sent abroad? For since a Narrative (if I rightly understand the word) is so called from it's declaring, *shewing forth*, telling abroad, or publishing what is contained in it, I am to learn how any thing can properly be called a Narrative, which is not intended to be sent abroad. But that which utterly *cracks the Credit* of that Relation which, thus *contrary to your own agreement*, you have dispersed, is, That your selves do here confess, that in that Meeting nothing was so read, a mended and finally agreed upon to be a true Record or Memorial of the Conference, nor yet anything witnessed by the six chosen on either side to subscribe the same. And yet it seems you could pick up enough to fill about ten Sheets of Paper (by your own acknowledgment) though nothing was agreed on in the Meeting to be a true Record or Memorial of the Conference. How little this bespeaks Truth in your Relation let others judge. Nay, you seem your selves to account the Truth of your Relation but a Circumstance, for you say, thus, *Which being considered, together with this Circumstance, that the Manuscript hinted to be given forth was the Truth, &c.* You pretend that the person who signed the Argument with W. R. interrupted the orderly Proceeding of the Meeting: But you shew not wherein, nor give any thing like a Demonstration thereof. You refer indeed most confusedly and distractedly to the 22. Section of this second Part (when there is no such thing in your Book) and desire the Reader to peruse a Section which is not extant. But it is certain you your selves interrupted the orderly proceeding of the Meeting: For in order to an Orderly proceeding, the 4. Article of your Agreement did provide, *That matters on subjects to be debated on by each Party, be first written down, and respectively delivered to each other.* But for all this, and notwithstanding that you say, page 11. *The aforesaid Dissatisfactions relating to G. F. were delivered in the Meeting*, yet your selves will know (who were concerned in that affair) that you charge against G. F. though often called

called for and demanded, could not be obtained, nor was delivered in, until the last of the three Meetings. So that your saying your dissatisfactions relating to G. F. were delivered in the Meeting, is a fallacy and equivocation. And though you stick not to call it in page 17. a notorious Untruth and a lye, That Articles and Covenants were drawn and agreed on both sides, that no Papers were to go forth, without the consent of both parties: Yet I dare submit it to the judgment of any indifferent and considerate Reader, whether the plain purport, intent and meaning of the Articles of agreement, as your selves have set them down, was not, That no paper as a Narrative or Relation of the proceedings of that Meeting, should go forth without the consent, of both Parties. Besides, that it may appear how inconsistent your Practises are with your Pretences, I shall desire the Reader here to observe how forward you (who often pretend as if you had been very backward and unwilling to widen the breach, to enlarge the Controversy, to spread the knowledge of the differences further by sending abroad Papers, &c. how, for ward I say, you, under the feigned Pretences) have been, even so long ago as the year 77. to send abroad a Manuscript of about ten sheets of paper, containing your dissatisfactions concerning G. F. and other Friends, and to disseminate this up and down, through the Nation, from Town to Town, and County to County, where ever you could get an Entrance.

Sett. 7. But leaving this to the Reader's Consideration, I observe that your Envy to G. F. pricks you forward to Charge him with Writing a Letter to a Friend (concerning William Rogers his disposing that Narrative) and that too to such an one, say you, who hath suffered one that is no Friend to have a fight thereof. This serves you to make a noise with, and to increase the number of your Pages: For it takes up pag. 38, 39, 20. here, and yet we had had it before in the Postscript, pag. 13, 14. But what is there in your Clamour, besides an empty sound? If G. F. Writing to a Friend, did take notice of one Friend William Rogers, &c. had done him, in spreading abroad a bad and Lying Paper against him, who was in fault. He in mentioning the wrong they did him, or they in doing it. If (as you say) that Friend did suffer one who is no Friend to have a fight

sight of that Letter (which if so, is more like to be casually than purposely done) yet *what is that to G. F.* ? you cannot say that that Friend had any Order, Direction or Allowance from G. F. so to do. So that your charging that upon G. F. is a manifest token of Envy and Injustice in you. But have you and your Party been so careful, that nothing of this kind may be charged upon your selves? If not, you had better have been Silent in this Case. You may do well to make inquiry amongst your own Party, whether some of them did not send either that very Lying Paper mentioned in G. F.'s Letter, or some other of like import, to others of their Party, by a man of the World, by which means it came to the view of a Priest to make sport with, before it reached the Hand of them to whom it was sent.

G. F.'s Mentioning *William Rogers* and his Company, you call *the term of an haughty and scoffing Spirit*, pag. 19. But are you content to take what you give? Then turn to *J. Wilkin-*
son's Letter to G. F. Printed in your 4 Part, pag. 43: where you may read *J. W.* writes thus to G. F. *Let it be a warning to thee, and reprove thy Company*, &c. Henceforth if *J. W.* be taken to be of an *Haughty Scoffing Spirit*, he may in part thank you for it.

Self. 8. In pag. 21. you let down part of a Letter from G. F. to *John Story* concerning the unfaithfulness of Writing and Spreading that Narrative without the knowledge or consent of both Parties, contrary to the agreement made at *Bristol*. In this Letter (so far at least as you have Printed of it) *W. Rogers* was not Named, nor any else particularly: Yet *William* being *gauled* presently *winches*; and as one that knew himself guilty, takes it to himself, and flies out into reviling Exclamations against G. F. calling his Letter an *Unrighteous Reproach*, *ungodly-reproach*, *scandalous-reproach* (three times over in a matter of Ten Lines) but not a word here for the clearing himself or his Party from being of a *Covenant-breaking Spirit*; and no wonder, for he knew that he and they had spread abroad their Narrative, and that in a secret *underly* way; and that this was contrary to their agreement, none can doubt that considers the intention of their agreement. But thou insinuat-
 est,

est, *William*, as if *G. F.* had a design to defame thy Reputation as a proper expedient to bring a withering on thy outward Estate, and thereupon thou spreadest thy Sails, displayest thy Colours, magnifies thy Industry, and proclaimest thy self a Merchant, an Industrious Merchant. *Tis well known*, (sayst thou, pag. 22.) I have hitherto comfortably maintained my Self, my Wife, my Children by my Industry as a Merchant. Yes, yes, no question this was well known, and so well known, that had it not been to introduce something else, which perhaps was not so well known, or at least not so well known as thou wouldst have it, I can hardly think thou wouldst have publish'd a thing so well known as this was. Therefore I observe thou addest [*And been able to be Assisting unto others in my Generation.*] This I perceive thou wert big with, and seemdest in pain till 'twas out. In thy Preface, pag. 13. Thou couldst not forbear boasting, though thou wert fain to fetch a great compass, and strain hard too to bring it in, and yet at length it was fain to come in a Marginal Note, That thou hast been enabled by that method of Trade thou art in, not only to provide for thy Family, but to administer to the Relief of others also. The World must know it seems, and rather than fail from thy own Pen, not only that thou art a Merchant, an Industrious Merchant, but a Charitable Merchant too. Well, be it so, the Information however is of little use to me. I should have believed as much, though thou hadst not given it under thy Hand. If thou hast given Alms to be seen of men, thou knowest what follows, Mat. 6. 1, 2. But certainly, *William*, thy liberality had look'd more like Charity, and less Pharisaical, had this Trumpet never been sounded.

From thy Charity thou passest to thy Sufferings, and hookest in an occasion to tell the World how much thou hast been Fined, how well thou wert Stock'd, and how much thou lost; The Fines, thou sayst, laid on thee, exceed 90 if not 100 l. pag. 23. (and lest this should not be sufficiently Noted, it is repeated in a Marginal Note on purpose in pag. 29.) As for Stock, besides what thou hadst secured, thou tellest us thou hadst in that place, within doors and without, about 300 l. worth; and thou addest, That a Mare of 12 l. was taken from thee. Now really *William*, as I think these things were not worth thy Writing, so I should not have thought them worth my Noting, were it not
to

to see thee see, how thou art over-run with *Ticks of Offensation*, and how ill it becomes thee. *Setting* The rest of thy fifth Part, *William*, is so full of Confusion and *Scurrilous* Revilings, with *Lye, Lye, Lye*, at every turn, as if *Lying* were the *Mist* thou treadst in, and a part of the Merchandize thou so *Industriously* *drivest on*. I cannot but acknowledge I have been greatly mistaken in thee: For I took thee for a man that had at least pretended to something of an *Ingenious* and *Civil Education*. But upon a deliberate Consideration I am now persuaded, That for *Railing*, *Reproaching*, *Reviling*, giving the *Lye*, and for other *Scurrilities* and *Unhealthiness* of *Style*, Thy Book may bid defiance to any Book that hath been Printed against the Truth, since Friends have been a People. But I intend not to be *Scavenger* to thy Book, and therefore will not rake in every *Puddle*, nor sweep every *Kemel*, but touch upon a few more Passages which show thy *Envy* and *Injustice*, and so draw to a Conclusion.

Thou Chargest *G. F.* in pag. 22. with making a *Falſe Certificate his Refuge*, and in pag. 67. thou settest down a *Certificate* Subscribed by 28 Friends of *Bristol*, whom thou liken'st to *Perjur'd Informers*. And yet thou thy self bringest ten several *Certificates* to defend *G. F.* by, which carry in them no probability of Truth. This shews thy *Partiality* and *Injustice*.

In pag. 71. thou sayst, *G. F. Informed thee, that some said thy Paper (which thou sentest to him) was not worth Answering*, and yet thou sayst, *G. F. hath written six Sheets of Paper in Answer to it*. Upon this thou beginnest to erect thy self and *Vaunt* a little; sayst thou, *Since G. F. hath acted contrary to their Sense, what's become of their Unity now?* And again, *This I take to be one sign or token, that the Word of the Lord by his Servant John Wilkinson is fulfilling*. This is a very slender *Braſs*, *William*, an idle poor *Brag*. What if some said thy Paper was not worth Answering, and yet *G. F.* Answered it? 'Tis probable enough *G. F.* might not think it worth Answering neither. And yet both he might see Cause to Answer it, and may for its being Answered. And therein he acted not con-

trary but according to their Sense, both with respect to the *worthlessness* of thy Paper, and also to the reason of Answering it. And then what's become of thy Cavi? For thou art extremely out, if thou thinkest there is *no other reason* for Answering a Paper, but the *worth* of it. Yes, yes, *William*, there may be many Inducements to Answer that, which in it self is not worth Answering. For instance, *A fool in his folly is not worth Answering*; yet it may be convenient sometimes to Answer him, *lest he grow wise in his own conceit*. And who knows how far *that very reason* might prevail upon G. F. in *this very Case*? But sure if thou hadst not been in great fear that *John Wilkinson* will be found a false Prophet, thou wouldst not have sought to have sheltered him under such a *silly* pretence as this. However since it is evident that G. F. and Friends are in Unity still, not broken, nor turned one against another, (as six years ago it seems *J. W.* Prophesied they would be) thou art to seek again for another *Fig-Leaf* to cover *J. W.* with, for this proves too *Thin* and too *Narrow* to hide him.

Sett. 10. The next thing I observe, *William*, is thy *fond attempt* to prove G. F. a *Flyer* in time of Persecution. I call it a *fond attempt*, because I think it can appear no other to any that know him, and the many Imprisonments, and Cruel Sufferings, he has undergone, for his *Faithfulness* to his Testimony. Thou bringest *four* Certificates, Subscribed in all by *six* persons, to prove that G. F. went out of a Meeting at *Bristol*, in a Suffering time, before the Meeting was ended. This is weighed down by another Certificate Subscribed by 28 Friends of *Bristol* Meeting. To discredit their Testimony, thou comparest them to *Perjured Informers*. I have learn'd better than to imitate thy *ill Language*; and therefore shall not *revile* thy Witnesses (as thou hast done those 28 Friends) but shall only make two or three Observations on them, and so leave them.

1. I observe, that four of thy six Witnesses against G. F. to wit, *Mary Gouldney, Mary North, Ann Day* and *Nathaniel Day*, do not only Certify matter of Fact, but matter of Faith (*their own belief*) also. They not only say G. F. departed out of the Meeting before it broke up; but they say *they believe* he *did*.

did, to avoid being taken prisoner. Had it not been enough for them to have certified manner of fact (if in truth they could so have done) and have left others to judge of the *Intention*? But this forwardness of theirs to certify *their belief of his Intention*, smells more of the *Accuser* than the *witness*s. 2d. I observe, that although in the first Certificate *Mary Gouldney*, *Mary North* and *Ann Day* speak only of a Meeting in *general* (out of which they say *G. F.* departed) without particularizing, or fixing upon any *certain day*, month, or year wherein that Meeting was held; yet *William James*, who subscribed the 2d. Certificate says, *To this Testimony I also can bear witness*; *Nathaniel Day*, who subscribed the 3d. Certificate, says, *I do remember on this Occasion AFORESAYD*, that *G. Fox* did depart out of the Meeting *AFORESAYD*, &c. And *Samuel Hollister*, who subscribed the 4th Certificate, says, *I do on the Occasion AFORESAYD declare, that I do remember, that G. Fox did depart out of the Meeting AFOREREMENTIONED*, &c. So that all thy three Men-Witnesses have reference to and dependence upon the Testimony of the three women, and undertake to speak of the *same* Meeting that the women speak of, although the women do not declare when that Meeting was which they speak of. Now how could these Men know, that the Meeting which each of them respectively mentions, is the *same* with that which the women speak of? nay how can they be assured that they themselves were present at that Meeting which the Women speak of, unless the Women had particularly assigned and ascertained what Meeting it was that they meant? This shews there has been a *Cabal* and *consultation held*, and that thou and thy witnesses have *laid your heads together*, and have hammered out one Certificate by another; how fairly, let others Judge. 3. I observe, that thy *prime* Certificate says, *G. Fox stood up and spoke in the Meeting*, and that it was at a time when *persecution attended Friends in their Meeting*. This plainly shews *G. F.* was far from shunning suffering, why else came he there? It was it seems a *suffering time*, Persecution they say attended the Meeting. This he knew before. If he would have avoided a Prison, he might have kept away, he needed not have come there. For he could have no assurance (outwardly) that if he came there he should escape. Yet thither he

went,

went, to that Meeting he came, It seems, and in that Meeting he stood up and spoke, by your own Confession, though he knew it was attended with persecution. Tell this to any considerate Man, and perswade him thereby, if you can, that G. F. did this to shew suffering, to avoid persecution. More might be observed from these Certificates, (as that, although they declare their belief that G. F. went out of the Meeting to save himself from being taken Prisoner by the Persecutors, yet it does not appear by any of these Certificates, either that any was taken Prisoner, or that any Persecutors came to the Meeting that day.) But I forbear insisting further on them, believing the weakness of those that subscribed them, and thy envy in publishing them, will from what is already observed, be obvious to every intelligent Reader.

I shall therefore take notice of what thou sayest in page 61. Where thou settest down two Sentences of G. F.'s delivered at several times and upon different Occasions; In one of which thou reportest him to say thus, *I remember I was sitting in a Meeting at Bristol, when another was speaking, and some officers came up, and took him away, and when he was gone, I kept the Meeting and none meddled with me.* In the other thou settest down his words thus, *As for the Meeting at Bristol, there came no Souldiers or Officers, while I was in the Meeting neither before nor after.* Hereupon thou sayst, *He that runs may read, that George Fox, in some Cases, doth not matter what he saith.* If envy had not made thy Pen run too fast for thy Understanding, thou mightest have seen, and read plain enough, that those were two distinct times and Meetings, whereof G. F. spoke. In the first, it seems, a Man was speaking, and some Officers came up, and took him away. In the second a Woman (Margaret Thomas) was speaking page 18 and the Meeting was quiet. What contradiction I pray is there in this? Might he not be in one Meeting where the Officers did come, and in another where the Officers did not come? Thy Certificates say nothing of any Souldiers or Officers coming into the Meeting that day, when they say G. F. departed before the Meeting broke up. And yet thou sayst page 26, 27, that the Persecutors came up one pair of stairs in your Meeting Room in Broad-Mead, whilst G. F. was speaking, and that on a sudden

he slept down, and hastned out of the Meeting at a Back pair of stairs. Either therefore thou must acknowledge, that this Meeting thou speakest of was *another* not the same with that which thy Certificators speak of, or else that thou and they *disagree* in your Relation of one and the same thing. The latter will not much credit your evidence, as the former will manifest thy envy and injustice towards G. F. in representing those two Sentences of his, which were spoken of *distinct* Meetings, as if they had been spoken but of one, merely that thou mightest thence take occasion to say, *George Fox*, in some cases, doth not matter what he saith. But this very Instance is enough to prove *William Rogers*, in case he may abuse G. F. *doth not matter what he says.* And therefore though thou sayst, *Thy Eyes were witnesses of what thou there chargest G. F. with, in relation to Bristol Meeting*, yet I assure thee if thy Eyes be like thy Tongue, they are not fit to be believed. The story thou relatest upon the Credit of thy Eyes is a very *blind story*. It agrees not well with itself, and worse with thy Certificates. Thou sayst, *The Persecutors came up one pair of stairs, in your Meeting Room in Broad-mead, whilst G. F. was speaking* (so that they must be in the Meeting, by thy Account, while he was speaking) and yet thou sayst, *he slept down on a sudden, and hastned out of the Meeting at a Back pair of stairs.* Does this sound *likely*? is it *probable* that, if the Persecutors were in the Meeting Room while he was speaking, they would have let him step down and hasten out, and not themselves have hastened to lay hold of him? But if this of it self look very unlikely, *William James's* Certificate (who is one of thy witnesses) will make it more unlikely: for he says, that *After G. F. slept down from the place he stood upon to speak, and was departing, some Friends were moving to go with him, and he perceiving it (as W. James took it) said, holding out his hand, Keep your Meetings, keep your Meetings; and accordingly (says he) the Meeting was held a considerable time longer after his departure.* Now what the Persecutors did *all that considerable time* that the Meeting was held after you say G. F. was gone, had been very *considerable* for you to have told: For they don't use to be idle when they come to take Prisoners. Yet according to thine and thy witnesses Relation, though G. F. was speaking

ing when they came into the Meeting, yet they let him alone; they suffered him to step down and quietly depart. Nay to speak to the Friends as he was departing: Nor only so, but they suffered the Friends to hold their Meeting a considerable time longer. And when all was done, it does not appear, from what thou and thy half dozen of Witnesses have said, that there was any one taken Prisoner that day, or any disturbance made. What Credit this Story deserves, I leave to the Reader to judge.

Some other small Observations thou hast, fitter for a Child than a Man to have made; as *that there were some Friends at Edward Pyott's, who he bid go away* (what else should they have done? Had it been common Discretion for them to have staid to have gone with him in a great Company in time of Persecution? Wherein had the Service of that lain?) *that Edward Pyott's Son (who thou knowest was a Young Lad then) accompanied him through the fields* (what matter how Young the Lad was if he were Old enough to know the way; for his business was but to shew him the way) *that when he met Dennis Hollister, Thomas Gouldney, and George Bishop, he bid them walk by* (and well he might I think. There were many People, he says, walking there; and was it fit, thinkest thou, that they should hear those Friends reasoning with him, and labouring to dissuade him from going to the Meeting?) *And though, sayst thou, at length he came to the Meeting* (at length too! At what length dost thou mean? It seems he was there as early at least as Dennis Hollister, Thomas Gouldney and George Bishop.) *And, addest thou, as is credibly reported, by back and unusual ways* (who I pray are thy Credible Reporters of this little credible Report? None of thy six Certificate-Witnesses say any thing to this purpose. Upon whose Credit then dost thou report it? Wilt thou pawn the little Credit of thy own Eyes again?) *Yet I find* (sayst thou, speaking of the Relation G.F. gave of this business) *not one word positively testifying, that he said in the Meeting, until the Meeting broke up.* How! not one word! Dost he not say, *When he came down stairs, many Friends were in the Street?* Was not that a sign the Meeting was broke up? And dost not thou within three or four Lines charge him with asking, as he went down, *Why do Friends*
busle

Envy and make such a throng? Was not that a sign the Meeting was up? Yes sure, and thy urging all these Impertinent Cavils is a sign thy Envy was up too, which made thee not matter what thou saidst, that thou thoughtst might tend to defame G. F.

Sect. 11. From these thou passest to other Observations, pag. 64, 65, 66. upon G. F.'s account of the Meeting at Ringwood, every of which thy Envy is very apparent. The first is, *Of great probability, that the Women that came from Pool should come two or three hours before the Meeting was to begin.* Would any one's *composed Head* have clog'd a Book with such an Observation as this! I am ready to say of this, as some body else (it seems) said of another of thy Papers, *It is not worth Answering*; and yet for a reason that might be given, I return this Answer to it. *It was in Summer-time, the Weather Hot; to avoid which those Women of Pool chose to come in the Cool of the Morning.*

The next thing thou takest notice of is, that G. F. *walk'd with a young man.* A shrewd matter indeed! But then there came an other young man; Well, what if there had come a third? Why, *This (sayst thou) is cause of Jealousy that G. F. had a sinister kind of design, to take Young men for his Companions.* Indeed! why so? If young men are in Truth, why may not they be accompanied with as well as Old men? I have read that the Company of *Hetericks and Scandalous Professors of Truth* was to be shunned, Tit. 3. 10. and 1 Cor. 5. 11. But I never read that any Faithful Friends Company was to be avoided because of their Youth. But this Cavil at their Youth Springs from an Old root of Envy in thee against G. F.

Another of thy Observations is, *That G. F. was for having a good Meeting after the Soldiers were gone.* And good reason too, if the Soldiers came so early as to be gone before Meeting time, as it seems they did, Thou addest, that *although the Young man said the Soldiers were Neighbours, and Civil People, and would hardly meddle, yet G. F. kept still walking in the Fields.* Ay, why not? It was two hours, it seems, before Meeting time. Did his walking in the Fields two hours before the Meeting, shew any design to shun the Meeting? 'Tis a sign thou wantest matter against

against G. F. when thou pickest up such trivial matter as these.

Thy fourth Observation is, *That one of the Young men, being gone about two Bow-shots from G. F. waved his Hat to him.* This I perceive thou wouldst have for a ballance to the Boy's standing on an Hill to wave his Hat, if any occasion offered, while John Story and others were at Meeting in By-places: But this will hold no Parallell; for that was a *designed* thing, this a *meet accident*; that Boy was *set on purpose*, this young man went there *by Chance*; That Boy was *appointed* to wave his Hat as a Token *agreed upon before hand*, this Young man waved his Hat of *his own accord*, without any appointment made. And though thou sayst it *may reasonably be supposed* he did it to keep G. F. from Meeting, yet thou wilt get nothing by that, for it appears G. F. would not be kept from Meeting, but when Meeting time came, to the Meeting he went; and a very large and Blessed Meeting they had, till about three in the After-noon; and then broke up the Meeting in the Power of God and in Peace, pag. 59. But as thou wouldst fain fasten some imputation upon G. F. but canst not; so thou endeavourest to palliate the matter on John Story's part, but with as ill success. Thou sayst, *the sending a Boy on top of an Hill, waving his Hat to Friends (spoken of by G. F. by way of Reflection on John Story,) is denied by John Story, and by his Accusers intended only (so far as thou understandest) to show Friends the way to the Meeting.* Thou mightest have added, *and to give them warning to shift for themselves if any Persecutors should have come.* And though thou here sayst John Story denied it, yet I do not find in his Answer to the 4th Query about it (4th Part, pag. 11.) that he denies it, but only says, *I remember no such thing.* But John Story's supposition can remember both the thing, and the person to whom (if I mistake not) he himself told, that John Story's own Brother was the Boy. But let it pass, as Howells seems was set on the Top of an Hill, waving his Hat to the Friends the way to the Meeting; and thou thinkest it was done for *Convenience*. A rare Convenience, to have Meetings in such *Blind Holes* and *Obscure Corners*, that the Friends that *hath* ~~hath~~ *go* to them could not find them, without a Boy to direct them by waving his Hat on top of an Hill. What *Sculking*, hiding work was this!

Y^t

Well

Well might one of your Party, have a Vision of your Separate Meeting *Sitting Sleeping under ground*, when they found such Contrivances, to hide and shelter themselves from Sufferings, as to Meet in Holes, Gills or Dells in the Earth, and that so *private* and concealed, that their own Friends, that were of the Meeting, could not find them, but a Boy must be set on top of an Hill, waving his Hat to signify which way they should pass. Was this to stand up for Truth? Was this to hold forth Truths Testimony as an *Ensign* to the World? Was this to be like a *City set on an Hill*? Was this to *set the Candle on a Candlestick*, that it might give Light unto all? Or to put it under a Bushel, in an Hole or dark Corner, lest any should see it, and find them out by it? This was not to bear a Faithful Testimony for Truth, but to shrink from their Testimony, and let their Testimony for Truth fall as in the Streets, which has been the burden of many of them since, as they acknowledged. Thou hintest that this was *when Friends met without Doors*; but that helps nothing: For why did they meet without doors? They might have met *within* if they would, as other Friends did. They were never *put out* of Doors (so far as I can learn) but voluntarily went out, and *forsook* their Meeting places, out of a *Self-Saving* design to avoid being Fined for their Meeting Houses. And when they had *forsaken* their Meeting places, and *put themselves* out of Doors, they had other Houses offered them, by Faithful Friends, to meet in if they would. *John Story* in his Answer to the 7th Query (4 Part, pag. 11.) confesses, *William Chambers* offered *his House*, but pretends it was too far for the greatest part of the Meeting to go, and says, *They were well satisfied with other places much nearer*. Yes no doubt, they that were so afraid of Suffering for Truth, as to forsake the Houses they were wont to meet in, for fear of being Fined, would be very well satisfied to creep into blind Holes and Corners to *save themselves*, though they *lost Truth*. And if all Friends had been as Unfaithful, Degenerate and Cowardly as *John Story* and those of his Party were, what had become of all Friends Meetings! And how had the Testimony of Truth fallen throughout the Nation!

Thy

Thy 5th Observation is, That G. P.'s words cannot reasonably be taken to import a denial, that he hid himself behind a Bank. This is not only malicious, but false: for in pag. 59. he says, He was out in the open fields, where the Souldiers might easily see him. That was far from hiding behind a Bank sure. And there was he walking before any Souldiers came, or he had heard any thing of their coming. Neither was it in Meeting time, but at least two hours before.

In thy sixth Observation there is another fallacy. Thou sayst, He went not into the House where the Meeting was, but to another, &c. This thou repeatst in thy seventh thus, If he had had so much patience as to have gone into the House, after Meeting, to Visit the distressed Family, the Woman being Dead. Whence dost thou infer that he went not into the House where the Meeting was? The Relation thou pretendst to make thy Observations upon, doth not say so; and he himself saith he did. 'Tis true that he did go to another House afterwards, but that he did not go into the House where the Meeting was, is false. For he did visit the distressed Family both before Meeting and after. So thou art guilty of a false Charge.

In thy 7th Observation thou sayst, Thou thinkst it is that Meeting at Ringwood (I report to thee) there are many notorious Circumstances, to shew him a Flyer in time of Persecution, yet thou observest he will give no opinion of this or that matter, saying, that he saith it is a True or false, which to thee (thou sayst) is a demonstration, that he could not in Truth deny other things reported of him on this occasion. It seems then thou thinkest he hath so much regard to Truth, that he would not deny what could not in Truth be denied. Well, thou art acknowledged from an Enemy to be something, though he does not need it. I wish the same could in Truth be said of thee. But where or what are the many notorious Circumstances thou speakst of as to that Meeting at Ringwood, which thou sayst (I report be True) shew him a Flyer in time of Persecution? Why didst thou not bring them forth? Can any one doubt but that, if thou hadst had such Notorious Circumstances, such a Notorious Report-Monger as thou art, who hast so often in this Book suggested thy Slanders upon Report, would have been forward, and

glad of the opportunity to have been the Reporter of such Circumstances, how *notoriously false* soever they had been :

These are the Observations, *William*, which thou it seems hast thought *worth making* upon G. F.'s Relation of Ringwood Meeting. But I desire thee not to think I have taken notice of them as thinking them *worth Answering* : For that I assure thee I did not, but upon another reason. I look upon them to be so entirely made up of *envy* and *falsehood* interwoven, that it will be obvious to the weakest sight; and that they smell so strong of *Malice* (with which transported, thou hast over-done thy design) that there is no likelihood any Body should believe thee, that is not like thee, and who are, are not to be regarded.

As for thy other Slander, which thou and thy Party would fasten on G. F. by several Certificates from his Enemies at Hertford and thereabouts, I think it not needful to say more than that thy *Wingless* should have agreed better in their Evidence, if they expected to have been believed. The incoherence of their Testimonies is sufficient of it self to discredit what they say. And besides, those Certificates have already been fairly examined, and the Invalidity of them fully laid open in another Treatise, called, *The Accuser of our Brethren cast down*, &c. To which I refer the Reader for more full Satisfaction, not only in this, but other particulars. And indeed, had I read that Treatise before I began this, or had I had that by me while I was Writing this, it might probably have either wholly diverted me from this undertaking, or at least have much contracted this work, by excusing me from meddling with, or insisting on many particulars, so fully handled and clearly enervated in that. But since Providence hath ordered it as it is, I shall not Apologize for the Writing of this, but leave the success and service of it to the Lord, desiring that Friends will be prudent and wary in the spreading of it, and not make it more publick, than (in the Wisdom of God) they see a just occasion for.

The

The Conclusion.

THUS, having gone through our Adversaries great Book, and in some measure discovered the *Envy, Falshood, Corruption, Contraditions, abominable Slanders, gross Perversions, foul Errors and false Doctrines* therein contained, I feel my Spirit, now in the Close, again drawn forth in the Love of God towards all those, who have been in any measure betrayed from the simplicity of the Truth, by the false Pretences and crafty Insinuations of the subtil Serpent and his Apostatized Instruments, (so far at least as to lend an Ear to their evil Scurriles, Jealousies, Whisperings, Backbitings and false Suggestions against the Faithful Brethren; but yet have not given way to that hardening of heart, that bitterness of Spirit, prejudice and Enmity, which hath drawn forth some into an Heady, Wilful, Obstinate and open Opposition to the Truth and People of the living God. Unto all such Beguiled-ones, is my Spirit, I say, drawn forth in the Love of the Lord and in tender Compassion unto them, I cannot but entreat and earnestly beseech all such to beware of and turn from that Spirit which hath brought forth such corrupt-fruits, as in the foregoing Treatise are Detected. And think it not sufficient, Friends, that you do not publickly own that wicked Book, (which indeed I have never yet met with any that would, save him only whose Name is to it, as the Author) in which those Corrupt Fruits are brought forth: But consider this well, That though you should escape the snare of that Spirit in this one particular, of not owning his Book; yet if you at all mysticly, partake or side with any thing else which that Spirit leads into, you cannot chuse but be polluted thereby, and entangled therewith. Therefore wait, O Friends, as you regard your Spiritual Life and Peace with God, wait singly and Honestly, I entreat you, upon the Lord, for a further, fuller and clearer discovery of the *Mysterious workings and Transformings* of this deceiving Spirit, that in all its appearances you may see and shun it, and not be taken or held by it.

God Almighty, the Father of mercies, in tender Com-
 passion to his People, *Strip this false Spirit* more and more out
 of all its painted Colours, and by the bright shinings of his
 Heavenly Light, make it more manifest to every Honest heart;
 and *bruise the Head* if it by the Smitings of his power, that it
 may no more prevail upon any. But that all who have been
misled thereby, may see and avoid its *Snarles*, and in the Hu-
 mility waiting low before the Lord may feel the *redeeming*
 Judgement to arise, and go forth against that which is for Judg-
 ment, and therewith the *restoring, healing* Virtue of the Divine
 Life to Spring, to *heal* Backslidings, and to *restore* into the path
 of Peace; that all such as through *weakness* and *ignorance* have
 been *drawn aside*, may *return* into the Blessed Unity of the
 Gospel, and none may be lost that can be saved. For this
 the breathing Travail of my Spirit is, and for this end chiefly
 was this work at first undertaken by me.

T E

T H E E N D.

